ol. XCIV, No. 4 April, 1936

The Ecclesiastical Review

onthly Publication for the Clergy Cum Approbatione Superiorum

CONTENTS

A PLAN FOR AN AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CATHOLIC HOME MISSIONS TO OPERATE IN THE RURAL SECTIONS OF THE UNITED STATES ... 337
The Reverend W. HOWARD BISHOP, Clarksville, Maryland.

THE PRIEST AT PRAYER ... 348
The Right Reverend Monsignor WILLIAM J. KERBY, Ph.D.

THE CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY ... 357
BERNARD J. MÜLLER-THYM, St. Louis, Missouri.

THE LITURGICAL PRONUNCIATION OF LATIN ... 376
The Right Reverend Monsignor H. T. HENRY, Litt.D., The Catholic University of America.

FINE LANGUAGE IN CATHOLIC PRESS AND PULPIT ... 392
The Reverend MARTIN W. DOHERTY, Estacada, Oregon.

THE HIGH SPIRIT OF THE GERMAN CATHOLICS ... 399
The Very Reverend J. P. CANON CONRY, Dublin, Ireland.

THE SEVEN JOYS OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN ... 405
The Reverend PETER B. DUFFEE, O.F.M., New York City.

SACRIFICING THE SPIRITUAL FOR THE TEMPORAL ... 409

THE PRIEST'S MANNER OF ASKING MATRIMONIAL CONSENT OF PARTIES 411
The Very Reverend VALENTINE T. SCHAAF, O.F.M., J.C.D., Brookland, D. C.

A CHURCH ERECTED ON A BURIED TEMPLE ... 417

RECENT CANON LAW LITERATURE ... 418
The Reverend EDWARD G. ROELKER, S.T.D., J.C.D., Washington, D. C.

CONTENTS CONTINUED INSIDE

PUBLISHED BY BOARD OF TRUSTEES
OF THE
AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW
FOR
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

1722 Arch Street
PHILADELPHIA

Copyright, 1935. American Ecclesiastical Review

Subscription Price: United States and Canada, $4.00—Foreign Postage, $1.00 additional
Agents } Great Britain: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., 43 Newgate St., London, E. C. 1, England
Ireland: Veritas Company, Ltd., 7 & 8 Lower Abbey St., Dublin
Australia: W. P. Linehan, 244 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne, C. 1.
Entered, 2 July, 1904, as Second Class Matter, Post Office at Lancaster, Pa., under Act of 3 March, 1879
March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925. Published at 113 E. Chestnut Street, Lancaster, Pa.

American Priests are becoming more and more Canon Law minded. Evidences abound of this growing clerical interest in the Church's legislation. Ever since the publication of the new Code of Canon Law, in 1918, articles on the several phases of this subject have been appearing in our ecclesiastical reviews and many books on legal topics have been published.

Take an instance or two in point . . .

First: Within a twelvemonth of its first appearance in English, Archbishop Cicognani's CANON LAW has passed into its second edition. It has now been revised, page for page, by the author himself and the two translators, so as to bring it abreast of the most recent decisions of the Holy See. Experts in both civil and canon law have welcomed the volume as an outstanding piece of scholarship as well as a practical authority in its field. Its exhaustive commentary on each Canon of the First Book of the Code, the key to the rest of the Books of the whole Code, merits a sure place for the volume in every priest's working library.

In a recent message to the publisher, Archbishop McNicholas is good enough to say: "You have done a great service to the Church in publishing CANON LAW by His Excellency the Apostolic Delegate. It is the best and most complete commentary on the portion of Canon Law that it covers. We require our seminarians to have it as a companion volume of the Code."

Price, $5.00 *net*

* * *

Second: Another notable book in this clerical field has recently appeared—CANONICAL EVIDENCE IN MARRIAGE CASES, by the Rev. Francis Wanenmacher, Doctor of Canon Law of the Catholic University of America, Pastor Consultor and Pro-Synodal Judge of the Diocese of Buffalo.

Quite obviously, this is a book priests need in untangling the countless marital difficulties that are constantly being brought to the parish rectory. What the priest should do in the face of these problems and how they are to be canonically handled is the subject of this thoroughly practical handbook for the parish rectory.

Price, $3.50 *net*

CONTENTS CONTINUED

STUDIES AND CONFERENCES:

Fine Language in Catholic Press and Pulpit 391
The Reverend Martin W. Doherty, Estacada, Oregon.
The High Spirit of the German Catholics 399
The Very Reverend J. P. Canon Conry, Dublin, Ireland.
Church Goods destroyed by Fire during Mission 404
The Seven Joys of the Blessed Virgin 405
The Reverend Peter B. Duffee, O.F.M., New York City.
Sacrificing the Spiritual for the Temporal 409
Books Proscribed by Apostolic Letter 410
The Very Reverend Valentine T. Schaaf, O.F.M., J.C.D.
Manner of Priest's asking Matrimonial Consent of Parties 411
The Very Reverend Valentine T. Schaaf, O.F.M., J.C.D.
Authorization of the Baltimore Catechism 414
The Reverend F. A. Walsh, O.S.B., Ph.D., Director, Confraternity of Christian Doctrine.
Indulgences for the Way of the Cross 415
Are Relics kissed or applied to One's Head? 416
A Church erected on a Buried Temple 417
Some Recent Pontifical Appointments 417

ECCLESIASTICAL LIBRARY TABLE:

Recent Canon Law Studies 418
The Reverend Edward Roelker, J.C.D., The Catholic University of America.

BOOK REVIEWS:

De Wulf-Messenger: History of Medieval Philosophy 428
Burke: Lent and the Mass 429
Collins: The Church Edifice and Its Appointments 430
McSorley: The Sacrament of Duty 432
Varceno-Loiano: Institutiones Theologiae Moralis 433
Janssen-Sister M. Alicia: Meditations for Religious 434
Cooper: Religion Outlines for Colleges. Course I 435
Horan: A Catechism of Christian Doctrine 436
Schumacher-Sister M. Imelda: Learning My Religion 436
D'Arcy: Pain and the Providence of God 437
Poppy-Martin: The Third Order of St. Francis in U. S. A. 438
Ward: Music, Second Year 439
Ives: The Ark and the Dove (Religious Liberties) 440
Berdyaev: The Bourgeois Mind 442

LITERARY CHAT .... 444 BOOKS RECEIVED 445

ESSENTIALIA PHILOSOPHIAE

Quae in Usum Incipientium Digessit

FRANCISCUS P. SIEGFRIED

olim in Seminario S. Caroli Borromaei Philadelphiense Professor

Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged

Pocket Summary of Catholic Philosophy, giving the essentials of Logic, Ontology, Cosmology, Psychology, Theodicy, Ethics, briefly, clearly, in form of question and answer.

All set forth in graphic survey. For students of Philosophy in the Seminary and for maturer students who desire to make a rapid review of their Philosophy.

$1.80 a copy postpaid

The Dolphin Press - - - 1722 Arch Street, Philadelphia

THE CHURCH EDIFICE
AND ITS
APPOINTMENTS

By the Rev. Harold E. Collins, Ph.D.

Foreword by the Most Reverend John J. Mitty, D.D.,
Archbishop of San Francisco.

* * *

THE PURPOSE OF THIS BOOK is to present a good, working summary of the laws, taken from the Official Books of the Church, governing the building, the dedication, and the furnishings of a Catholic church; also the canonical legislation of the Parish Registers, as a help to the Bishop and the Pastor on the occasion of the Episcopal Visitation of a Parish.

The building or the remodeling of a church is always a matter of deep concern to Bishops and Pastors faced with the task. All these details are taken care of by church legislation. But the difficulty arises when the Bishop or Pastor proposing to build a church attempts to put his finger on these regulations. They are widely separated in various books, which are not easily accessible; and it would seem that *no attempt has heretofore been made to bring them together between the covers of a handy volume.*

Again, the inspection of a church and its furnishings during the Episcopal Visitation is also a concern to both Bishop and Pastor. While a list of articles to be inspected is easily available, the actual legislation concerning each article is not so easy to find.

The Bishop, the Pastor, the Architect and the Contractor, even firms that supply church furnishings, all will find the work a valuable addition to the shelves of their libraries.

A Separate Chapter is Devoted to

I. The Building of a Church
II. The Dedication of a Church
III. The Divisions of a Church
IV. The Altar
V. The Tabernacle
VI. Furnishings of the Altar
VII. Furnishings of the Sanctuary
VIII. The Sacred Vessels
IX. Altar Linens
X. Sacred Vestments
XI. The Parish Register

216 pages, attractively bound in blue cloth—Price, $1.50

THE DOLPHIN PRESS
1722 Arch Street -:- Philadelphia, Pa.

THE

ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

TENTH SERIES.—VOL. IV.—(XCIV).—APRIL, 1936.—NO. 4.

A PLAN FOR AN AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CATHOLIC HOME MISSIONS TO OPERATE IN THE RURAL SECTIONS OF THE UNITED STATES.

Brief Résumé.

1. The plan herewith presented proposes the establishment of a religious Society to labor for the conversion of America to the Church of Jesus Christ with the same earnestness and determination and on the same intensive basis as our foreign missionary societies are laboring for the conversion of the people of foreign lands.

2. The proposed Society would be composed of secular priests without vows, banded together under a superior and a rule in the manner of the Sulpicians and Maryknollers. Coöperating communities of Sisters and Brothers would be formed as opportunity affords.

3. The method of the Society would be twofold:

(1) Direct contact with the mission field (a) by parochial activity in weak country parishes assigned to it, and (b) by annually repeated missions with careful mail following-up work in the purely non-Catholic territory surrounding these parishes.

(2) Indirect contact, by making their technique, inspiration and other helps available at all times to the rural diocesan clergy throughout the United States by printed propaganda and short courses for mission-minded priests.

4. The Society would centre its activities upon the rural sections, first, because it is there that the Church is weakest and secondly because the populations of these sections give the greatest promise of future increase and exercise a dominant influence upon the future of our urban centres. The prudent use of social activities, founded upon rural life, to aid in the work of conversions, would be carefully studied and applied wherever they would be found helpful.

5. The Society would seek limited, not perpetual, tenure of mission areas. The contract with the Ordinary would provide for their taking over an area (overwhelmingly non-Catholic) for a definite minimum number of years, after which the Ordinary would be free to reclaim the area for the diocesan clergy and assign new territory to the Society.

6. It is felt that the vast importance and extent of the rural mission field as well as the specialized training that will be necessary and the persistence through succeeding generations of the objectives that are sought, call for a separate religious community with its own Superior and Rule to lead the way, develop missionary technique and supply methods and other helps to mission-minded diocesans not specially trained for this work.

SEVERAL YEARS AGO the writer addressed a questionnaire to Catholic leaders all over the United States asking them to recommend measures for bringing more converts into the Church. A digest of their replies was read before the Catholic Rural Life Conference at Lansing, Michigan, in October 1929, and printed in THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW of December 1929. Among those who replied were prelates, educators, editors and heads of various religious organizations of men and women. The suggestions were serious and practical. Since then two very striking moves have been made toward permanent programs of convert-making; the establishment in this country of the splendid work of the Catholic Evidence Guilds of England and the revival by Bishop Hafey, of the North Carolina Apostolate established by the Rev. Father Price. The first of these agencies confines its activities to the cities and has no way of checking its results. The second seems to be chiefly rural, but confined within the boundaries of a single diocese. With both of them the writer is in heartiest accord, and far from introducing a conflicting note into the home mission field, desires nothing so strongly as that his suggestions may be found both harmonious and coöperative with these and any other agencies that may have taken form without his knowledge. The present article, published at the suggestion of his Ordinary, for the purpose of eliciting discussion and comment from the clergy, is his own reply, after six years of further deliberation, to the question he asked in 1929: " What should be done about converting America to the Church? "

The conversion of America to the Church of Jesus Christ is, consciously or unconsciously, the cherished wish of every fervent Catholic in these United States. Yet how many of us realize that such a task can never be accomplished so long as our organized efforts at convert-making are practically all initiated and used up in our cities and towns? The rural districts are the prolific source of increase of our native-born population. They are the human reservoirs from which the cities themselves draw their growth. The fruits of the Church's missionary activities in the cities are being bequeathed to a constantly diminishing posterity as the urban birth-rate continues to decline. For the preservation of her strength in these very cities where she now seems so firmly intrenched, it is expedient that she begin to turn a notable part of her efforts at convert-making to the people of the rural sections.

What is the present situation in rural America? Although there are sections that are thickly populated with Catholic families, these sections are few and far between. For the most part it is a missionary field and one in which no well organized and preserving effort has yet been made on a national or even a wide regional basis to convert its millions of non-Catholic people. Only in late years, since the organization by Bishop Edwin V. O'Hara of the Catholic Rural Life Conference has the attention of our leaders been turning countryward. But even our rural religious movement, equipped with such efficient instruments as Religious Vacation Schools and Confraternities of Christian Doctrine, has up to the present time been purely defensive—to hold the souls already Catholic by throwing about them the safeguards of religious education and reclaiming, so far as possible, those who have strayed from the Faith. As a field of offensive missionary enterprise the country is still, with the exception of local efforts of the type already alluded to, a virgin field.

Is it not time to seize upon this fact with the same earnestness and determination as we do upon foreign missionary opportunities far from our shores? Does the command to " Go teach all nations " make an exception of our own? These vast sections of our land, with their scattered millions of people, overwhelmingly non-Catholic and largely non-Christian, are just as legitimate a field of missionary activity as Africa and China.

It is the conviction of the writer and many others with whom he has discussed the subject that a small but constantly increasing army of missionaries should start upon this task. They should receive careful training adapted to the difficult work ahead of them and they should be as definitely committed to giving their careers to the rural missions, though without unreasonable rural bias, as those who cross the seas to labor for Christ in distant lands are committed to the service of the foreign missions.

It is not a task for any of the established orders, already burdened with their own appointed work, to take up as a side-issue. If it is to be effectively done it should be approached from the start as a highly specialized work, for it will require special adaptability and special training. It will have to develop a distinctive technique of its own. The city methods will not do. An entirely new community of priests will be necessary if a permanently continuing work is to be done. Stability and perseverance cannot be insured without the combination of unified control and permanent establishment, duly ratified by ecclesiastical authority. Furthermore, not only is a distinct new organization called for, but the task to be undertaken is so vast and so momentous that the community that begins it should resolve to give its whole attention to it. If facts are needed to support this contention, let us consider the following:

1. The cities, with an insufficient birth-rate to sustain their population even in normal times, draw their increase in native-born population from the country. The country homes, unlike those of the city, produce children far in excess of the number necessary for mere survival. They provide for the survival and increase of the race both rural and urban. These vast regions, overwhelmingly non-Catholic, with their strategic importance for the future population growth of our nation, are destined to change the religious complexion of our cities unfavorably to the Church if their Catholic population is not greatly increased. The cities are our stronghold to-day. But what will our situation be in years to come?

2. The cities, with their high cost of land and housing, high taxes, high rents and congested living, are unfavorable to the development of normal families and therefore to a Christian program of life. For the same reason they are most favorable

to the growth of birth-control, which is working upon the morals of our people devastating effects that the Church has been powerless to check. This means the growth of a type of Catholicity in our cities that is nullifying the Church's moral law while professing to believe her teachings. It means the growth of another type of Catholicity, which is fast ceasing either to profess or believe. These cities are our stronghold to-day. But what will become of our boasted strength in future years?

3. In the cities, the home, most venerable of all God-made human institutions, is folding up and going out of business. Home and family are the unit of which both Church and State are formed, essential to the welfare and survival of both because necessary to the survival of purity, loyalty, obedience and all the virtues that make for stamina and citizenship, necessary for the survival of life itself. These cities that are working toward the extinction of the family as an institution and the destruction of so many of the fundamental sanctities of life which depend upon the family, are the citadels of Catholic strength to-day. What shall we say of that strength in years to come?

4. The cities are the native habitat of Communism. In their artificial, man-made, mechanistic environment, this ugly creation of misguided man came into being and in them it has found its heartiest reception and most rapid growth, despite the strength of the Church in our industrial centres. If the Church in the places where she is strongest, has failed to hold in check this great social menace of our times, what shall we say of her power to conquer it in the future?

5. Against the inroads of these destructive heresies the country offers a natural resistance. To the doctrine of birth-control it opposes the demand for children on the farms where chores are to be done and where plenty of fresh air and wholesome food and ample shelter are comparatively inexpensive. To the home-destroying influences generally it opposes the fact that on the farms home life and farm enterprise are inseparable, the one being necessary to sustain the other. To the threats of Communism it opposes the stern individualism of the farmer, his love of home and family and utter inadaptability to a regimented existence. It adds furthermore the greater economic security of the farms. I say rural conditions offer a natural

resistance to the destructive influence of birth-control and Communism. I do not contend that they offer a perfect barrier to these movements. Both of them, (especially the former) have made inroads and will go further unless they are checked. The supernatural resistance of the Church must be added to the natural resistance of rural living before the barrier is perfect. And the supernatural Church needs this natural foundation, so congenial to her growth and welfare, needs to broaden her base upon it if she would rise to her maximum effectiveness or even maintain her present strength in the places where she is strongest to-day.

6. But the best of all reasons is that these millions of rural people are God's creatures and our brethern and fellow-citizens. Regardless of their strategic importance or unimportance, they are hungering for the truths of the Gospel and they have a claim upon us at least as strong as that of the Chinese and the Africans.

For these six reasons it is clear that the rural mission field is of sufficient importance to engage the entire attention of at least one missionary foundation. There is none devoted exclusively to it now. The Church of the future must throw as much of her initiative into the country as into the cities if she is to ward against an early decline and insure to herself a harvest of souls in America proportionate to the great expense and effort she is putting forth. If Catholics have not chosen the land for their habitations in numbers sufficient to insure security and future growth to the Church, we believe it is time to begin, with God's help, the great task of making Catholics of those who live on the land. It is a mammoth undertaking. Generations will be required to accomplish it. But cannot the same be said of every missionary enterprise? And the sooner we get to work, the sooner will results begin to show.

With these facts in view it is proposed that a religious Society of priests be established on a plan similar to that of the Catholic Foreign Mission Society of America (Maryknoll Fathers), with the special object of laboring for the conversion of the non-Catholic people of the United States from the vantage ground of the rural sections. Such a Society should be content with modest beginnings and a slow, steady growth in numbers and strength as God sends subjects and funds. When it becomes possible to do so, coöperating communities of Brothers and Sisters should be added, and the Society should have a headquarters, consisting of a Mother House for the Priests and Brothers and nearby a Mother-House for Sisters, all located in farming country but near a large city in a section where Catholicity is on a very sound footing numerically and highly respected and influential if not dominant.

The Mother House for Priests and Brothers should be a home for Priests and Brothers while not on the missions and a Novitiate and Seminary for young men preparing for ordination and profession. It should be surrounded by a farm, which would be worked by the Brothers, and from which the principal food necessities of the occupants of both houses would be drawn. The farm would permit large savings in the food budget and furnish a background for the rural work that the Society would undertake. Brothers should be trained for the various occupations which are found useful in an agricultural environment and which therefore would be helpful to the cause of the missions. Sisters would train as parish school teachers and parish visitors, with the domestic arts, handicrafts and music as sidelines. The priests, in addition to the usual seminary curriculum, should be instructed in a special technique of spreading the Gospel in rural sections, adapted from the methods of present home and foreign missionaries.

All Seminarians training for the Priesthood should be required by rule of the Society to do one hour's manual labor a day. This would serve them as a wholesome mental relaxation, an exercise in humility, a means of keeping in closer touch with the lives of the people whom they would look forward to serving and a safeguard against lonesomeness and discouragement on the missions. Every priest should be required by rule to return to the Mother House once a year for a visit of a few weeks to refresh his spiritual and physical energies and renew contact with his Superiors and fellow members, also as a precaution against lonesomeness, discouragement or the development of an inferiority complex as a result of long and uninterrupted life in regions where clerical contacts are few.

The plan of operation of the Mission Field would develop and be perfected with experience. No doubt it would vary widely in different regions, but something like the following plan might serve experimentally at least until a better one were developed or until trial proved this one to be satisfactory:

Having been invited to pursue missionary work in a given diocese, the Superior General of the Society asks the Ordinary to assign to the Society one established rural parish that is many miles from any neighboring parish, and where there is therefore no danger of encroaching on the rights of other Pastors. It should be in a section that is predominantly if not overwhelmingly non-Catholic. Two resident priests of the Society are appointed as pastor and assistant in this parish, to serve the year round. It will be known as the Base Parish of this particular mission area. To it as a base of operations, in the most favorable season of the year, there will be sent from the Mother House a band of two missionary Priests who, after consultation with the pastor and assistant, will settle upon four or five points in the surrounding country well beyond the present zone of Catholic influence. Equipped with a tent, a portable altar, and portable organ and accompanied by a Brother or two to help with the heavy work, they will establish themselves at each of these points for a period of two weeks, adapting the " camp meeting " idea, so familiar in the Protestant South, to Catholic missionary needs.

The program will consist of morning Mass and evening service daily. Mass may be followed by a short exhortation or instruction to any who may attend. During the day, the priests will pursue a systematic visitation of the homes in the neighborhood, getting acquainted and inviting the people to attend the evening service. This service will consist of a simple dogmatic instruction, followed by a hymn and the question box by one of the priests; then, after another hymn, a straight Catholic moral sermon by the other priest, dealing with the special moral problems of the times and region. The service may close with Benediction, if conditions permit that the Blessed Sacrament can be reserved or brought daily from the Base Parish. One of the priests should know how to lead the congregation in singing and someone should be obtained locally to play the organ. When the Base Parish is equipped with a convent, Sisters can drive out each day for this purpose.

During these two weeks names of interested listeners and inquirers will be gathered and sent in to the Base Parish where a systematic follow-up of Catholic literature by mail will be pursued, after the missionaries have left. The missionaries move on to the next outpost, then to the next, and so on, repeating the two-weeks mission program at each point until all the outposts which they planned to visit have been covered and the Base Parish is sending follow-up material to families in all of them. The mail follow-up continues during the succeeding months until the following year when the same or another band of missionaries returns and, with a change of subjects and treatment, repeats its two-weeks visits to each place covered the year before and gathers additional names. For four or five years or even more, if necessary, the same program is repeated, until there is a sufficient number of conversions in each outpost to establish a little mission church to be attended monthly by one of the priests at the Base. The objective is that each outpost will eventually become a Mission attended from the Base Parish and finally a Base Parish itself, with resident priests and its own ring of outposts to which missionaries are sent each year.

The Base Parish meanwhile is being developed by work among fallen-away Catholics and non-Catholics. Every approved means known to the Church and found practical in the region should be used by the two resident priests to attract converts as well as to retain and strengthen in the Faith those who are already members of the Church. Here will be splendid opportunities for the work of Catholic Evidence groups and Confraternities of Christian Doctrine. The laity should be pressed into service.

As early as funds are available and Sisters can be obtained, a small convent will be added to the Base plant. A group of the Society's own Sisters will be sent to do parish visiting and other social work among the people and conduct Vacation Schools of Religion for the children. As soon as there are enough Catholic children to make it worth while and sufficient funds can be obtained, a parish school should be added. The Sisters will wear uniforms rather than habits when on "out duty" and will drive their own machine.

Programs of approved social activities will be pursued among the people of the mission areas. Methods of approach used in various foreign mission fields and all other available sources will be studied in the preparation of subjects for missionary work. One of the aims of the Society will be to do all that it reasonably can do to help the people improve their temporal welfare, in order to win their confidence for the sake of the higher service it will hope to render them.

The program here outlined for one missionary enterprise in a single diocese will be duplicated in every diocese in which the Society gains admittance, so long as the Lord of the harvest sends sufficient laborers. It is not rapid and spectacular growth that will be desired, but slow, substantial progress, building solidly on each new advance, never going into a region without the determination, with God's help, to conquer it for Christ.

The proposed Society would be composed of secular priests, without vows, banded together for a common purpose. As soon as an area allotted by an Ordinary to the Society were sufficiently developed to be no longer missionary territory, it would be turned over to the Diocesan clergy and the priests of the Society would move on to a new frontier. They would be the advance guard, the shock troops, to open up new and even hostile territory. The contract with the Ordinary should provide for this arrangement by allotting the area to the Society for a definite period, say fifteen or twenty years, after which the Ordinary would be free to take over the area and allot new territory to the Society.

It is, of course, not contemplated that the proposed Society would soon or ever take care of the entire rural mission field, nor would such a thing be desired by its most ardent advocates. But the fact that its missionaries would be devoting their lives to the work here and there throughout rural America would serve to spread the mission spirit among the diocesan clergy and the number of independent volunteer undertakings would increase. It would help, as nothing else would, to make our rural diocesan clergy mission-minded and the various techniques developed by the Society would be at their disposal. When sufficient experience had been gained and sufficient materials gathered the Society would be in an excellent position to give annual short courses on rural mission technique to interested diocesans.

Members of the Society would not take the attitude of rivals and critics of the diocesan clergy, but of friends and co-laborers in the Lord's vineyard. It should be set down in their rule that they must cultivate the friendship and good will of all their clerical colleagues, whether regulars or seculars, and hospitality should be the unfailing custom in their houses.

It is in no spirit of presumption that the writer presents for discussion and comment by the clergy his plan for an American Society of Catholic Home Missions, but rather with the greatest eagerness that hands abler and worthier than his own may be found to put it into execution, if it be God's will that it should be carried out. The plan is, however, not the thought of a day or a week but the fruit of years of experience in the rural field. This experience has served to convince him that if America is to be won to the Church, nay if we are even to make substantial progress toward the conversion of the vast non-Catholic majority, some intensely interested group must lead the way to greater sacrifices for the cause in the neglected rural sections of our land.

Vocations will not be wanting to man such an enterprise when it is known that these sacrifices will be made under the inspiration and intelligent, sympathetic guidance of a permanent religious foundation with a definite plan of action based on the study of the best materials that missionary science has to offer, and therefore with the strongest assurance that human prudence can provide, of permanent results to be carried on and increased by future generations. That such a consummation may be brought to pass he begs the prayers of every interested reader.

W. HOWARD BISHOP

Clarksville, Maryland.

THE PRIEST AT PRAYER.

IF WE COULD KNOW thoroughly a priest's habits of prayer we would know many of the most important things about him. If we know how he prays, how much he prays, the motives that prompt him to prayer, the spiritual understanding that guides him, we have a fairly complete description of what he has done with his graces and what his graces have done for him. A priest like everyone else has a personal philosophy, a settled way of looking out upon the world, a judgment of responsibility, a scale of values deeper than all pretending, that expresses the unity of life and the relations of all of its phases. The place that prayer takes in that personal philosophy is a most significant revelation of one's actual understanding of the supernatural order and of one's place and relations in it as the representative of God. One can take no adequate attitude toward the Redemption without finding prayer in some form or another central in it. Behind every prayer that is uttered we find in its background the whole structure of the supernatural order, dogmatic truth and spiritual relations. Carelessnesses in respect of prayer, failure to understand its significant rôle in personal redemption and the redemption of the race, indifference to either its privileges or its obligations are structural flaws in the life of a priest that would be lamentable in the extreme. The insistence on prayer found among all of our teachers throughout the Christian centuries under the leadership of Christ has never exaggerated the importance of prayer or overstated its claims to the serious attention of the priest. The theme is so much insisted upon in seminary training, in our clerical retreats and in our spiritual literature that it appears to be commonplace. Of course, what is commonplace loses its appeal. Not without determined effort and much reflexion will a priest be the man of prayer as all priestly ideals represent him. By worthy and adequate prayer a priest enters into the noblest of all traditions, into association with the great lovers of Christ, with those who have responded to His appeal, with those who have been partners with our Lord in helping him to carry His Cross. Prayer invests life with singular majesty.

I.

A distinction must be made between liturgical and private devotions. Liturgical prayers have been gradually formulated and woven into public ceremonial, as the Church has interpreted the relations of humanity to God and of God to humanity in the Incarnation and Redemption of our Lord. Throughout all of this complicated process the Church undertook to impress upon the faithful the reality of the spiritual world. The symbols, prayers and ceremonies of the liturgy master the secrets of beauty and express spiritual emotion and the longing for forgiveness and peace with a power that words alone could never achieve. It guides us in adoration, atonement, thanksgiving and petition as humanity prostrates itself before the majesty of God and seeks release from error and sin in the hope of sharing the abundant life that Christ came to give. The prayers of the liturgy are prayers for humanity. The mission of the Church is to humanity. Those prayers are its appeal for mercy and hope.

Liturgical prayers are offered by a priest in the course of the living ministry of the Church to humanity. The Church formulates and sanctions such forms of prayer and guards their integrity with unceasing care. It is the duty of a priest to recite all such prayers with mind and heart brought by deliberate and consecrated effort into harmony with the mind of the Church. Dignity, reverence, sincerity are demanded in all liturgical prayer if it is to impress the faithful and win their hearts to God.

If we know the attitude of a priest toward all liturgical prayers we know very much about him. When that attitude is worthy it reveals to us the quality of his spiritual vision, his understanding of the mission of the priesthood and of the divine rôle of the Church in continuing the work of Redemption. The mastery of that attitude is a spiritual achievement of the very highest order. It requires alert attention, much self-control and systematic study. A thousand circumstances conspire against dignity and reverence in liturgical prayer. The hurry of life penetrates the sanctuary, disinclination for sustained effort accompanies the priest as his shadow might. Repetition leads to routine and routine kills spirit. Carelessness, lack of dignity, a spirit of routine, indifference to the meaning of the text in liturgical functions defeat the high purpose of the liturgy and deprive the faithful of opportunity for edification and strengthened faith.

It would not be fair to blame the priest for all of this. Crowded parish life in our modern cities leaves one little choice at times. What can one or two or three priests do if they are compelled to give five hundred Communions at a single Mass. The pressure for speed is so very great that the Mass itself is invaded by starting to give Communion after the Consecration. And many priests will give Communion going in both directions at the railing although it is forbidden. The words of the blessing are scarcely heard and all solemnity is sacrificed. Many violations of the rubrics are pathetic attempts to reconcile reverence and speed. I recall a gray-haired priest who said Mass one weekday in a convent chapel. His manner at the altar, his care for the ceremonies, the dignity of his movements and the penetrating note of sincerity that prevailed—all without exaggeration or affectation—left haunting memories that have survived these many years. The Mass did not take over five minutes more than the average. It told the observer very much about the celebrant.

One can at least love and study the rubrics and foster the spirit of the liturgy as a whole. But under the pressure of circumstances both knowledge and spirit suffer. A right understanding of the liturgy and insight into its spirit has a most wholesome reaction in the life of a priest himself. When he gives his best in effort, his best in spirit and understanding to every liturgical prayer that he utters, he is conscious of an active place in the unfolding work of Redemption. He is mediator between God and man. This realization will inevitably lift him to a high spiritual level and hold him there.

II.

Aside from liturgical prayers, formulated and sanctioned by the Church and entrusted to priests in their mission of sanctification, there are habits of personal piety to be found in the life of every priest. His prayers will tell him very much about himself if he wishes to know. In this field his own choice and habits prevail. They truly represent his judgment as they reveal his understanding of prayer as a duty or privilege. There are those who take many, if not all, of their personal prayers from the liturgy and this is greatly to be praised. There are those who find it an advantage to add to our general traditional forms of prayer, daily informal prayers that represent feeling, aspiration and petition at the moment. It appears that some write down their spontaneous prayers. Occasionally they become known. Many select their prayers from popular forms of devotion and books of prayer and are satisfied by making these forms personal. There is no form of human aspiration or need or hope or repentance that one cannot find expressed in our popular traditions of piety. What is necessary chiefly is that we care greatly and know that our prayers are highly prized moments of touch with God.

Meditation is a prolific source of spontaneous prayer. In it one's thinking is related directly to petitions that represent the actual aspiration or spiritual perception of the moment. After all that is possible is said in commendation of accepted forms of prayer they can be employed without directly deepening spiritual life in as far as thinking can deepen it. One who, for instance, confines his conscious repentance for sin to a simple act of contrition gains no new insight into himself as he would were he to reflect upon the history and meaning of sin not merely as a theological term but rather as a personal experience. This better understanding of sin from that standpoint should stir one to salutary consciousness of repentance that would seek earnest expression in many ways. One understands, of course, that the act of contrition as we know it summarizes the doctrinal truth perfectly. But there is a sorrow that is enriching. David would have robbed us of much spiritual help in repentance for sin had he confined himself to the simple act of contrition and never given us the *Miserere*.

A hint of this is found perhaps in most lives. At times of intense emotional experience when the routine of life is broken and one lives for the moment intensely, a sense of individuality appears. One seems nearer to God and has recourse to spontaneous prayer over and above the forms ordinarily employed. During serious and protracted illness, for instance, when one realizes danger to life, spiritual values are most clearly perceived and one takes refuge and finds hope in intensely personal prayer while God seems very near. When facing defeat or sinking under disaster and on occasions of very great happiness or great honor or when we stand by the remains of one dearly loved, a corresponding sense of individuality arises, and one makes prayer very personal. And even when traditional or habitual formal prayers satisfy one in such moods, they are recited with a depth of feeling to which one ordinarily does not attain. Our moods teach us how to pray.

One blessed advantage of forms of prayer universally known and used is that it makes prayer social. Many are thus enabled to come together and to find a common soul expressed by words and forms well known and dearly loved. This is notably true of the rosary. In more spiritual days it was the bond that held the family together in evening prayer. It was the call that brought great numbers of a congregation together for prayer before the parish Mass in a village church. It was the bond that united friends around the remains of one whom they had lost by death. It has not been unusual to see a succession of rosaries recited in this way by representatives of many organizations that would not have otherwise had a common voice. In this, of course, popular devotions come very near to the liturgy, which is essentially social: " Again I say to you that if two of you shall consent upon earth, concerning anything whatsoever they shall ask, it shall be done to them by my Father who is in Heaven. For where there are two or three gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."[1] All such associations of faith and prayer are priceless.

III.

Prayer is the greatest power in the world, judged from the standpoint of eternal values. The priest has the power of liturgical and personal prayer and he is responsible for its exercise. Geikie tells us of a noble motto that prevailed among the Jews at the time of Christ: " Everything depends upon God but a man's piety." These pieties represent his decision as to the way in which he will freely use this power that arises out of the Incarnation and the Redemption of our Lord and is entrusted to His priesthood and His followers to continue the work of redemption, sanctification and peace.

Our prayers follow our solicitudes. We pray when we care and we do not pray when we do not care. A Christian in the true sense can be in effect none other than one who makes the solicitudes of Jesus Christ his own solicitudes. Those solicitudes are completely expressed through the varieties of liturgical prayer, for they are always and for all time in the mind of the Church. When those prayers are offered with earnestness and reverence and in harmony with the mind of the Church we are serving well the solicitudes of Jesus Christ.

---

[1] Math. 18: 19-20.

It is nothing short of inspiring to realize the extent to which the laity and religious of all kinds in the Church cherish those solicitudes in their daily prayers, their penances, their motives and acceptance of the Divine Will. Every experience in life may be made into a prayer. The angels wait for the day when all men may stand with reverent faith before God and with bowed heads express mind and heart in the noble petition—" Thy Will be done though in my own undoing."

Prayers for the souls in Purgatory, for the conversion of sinners, for those about to die, for priests, for missions and missionaries, for the blessing of God upon all good works and holy intentions, for those who suffer and are without comfort, for the poor, for the protection of the innocent, for those in danger of sin—to mention these as illustrations only, massive, varied and constant as we find them throughout the entire body of the faithful—show the extent to which the solicitudes of our Lord are served with personal loyalty and constant zeal by believing hearts. Their deepest longing is that His mercy be made effective and that His love be not baffled by man.

All of this is involved in the spirit of prayer. When genuine it cannot be self-centered, narrow or notional. It fosters and expresses personal virtues, of course, but the solicitudes of Christ include all men. They who love Christ are always concerned about His interests.

IV.

One hesitates to speak with too much assurance in the presence of mystery. Prayer is enveloped in mystery. That this tremendous power should be placed in the hands of man is beyond our understanding. One must imagine the benevolence of God held back under the restraints of divine wisdom awaiting our call singly or collectively to send expected benevolences into human lives. We here meet the mystery of human solidarity—

that inspiring yet awful law of mutual dependence, the perilous gift of human responsibility by which we choose to work with and for God or we choose not to do so or to do so half-heartedly. One may say again that the background of prayer is the whole field of supernatural truth and destiny.

The priest has a wide range of solicitudes which he is called upon to serve by prayer, supplementing his liturgical activity and prayers already referred to. The mind of the Church is well expressed in respect of a pastor when it holds him to the strict obligation of saying the *Missa pro populo.* Here he is taught that the interests of the faithful committed to his care are objects of his personal spiritual solicitude. The priest who does not reënforce his work as pastor by his own constant and earnest prayer for those whom he serves fails in some measure to make the solicitudes of Christ his own. The utmost that the zeal of priests can accomplish in service and ceremony, in the upbuilding of parish organizations, in the maintenance and encouragement of schools and in the right ordering of parish life will still leave undefended frontiers through which error and sin and doubt and skepticism can penetrate minds and souls to their destruction. This is particularly true in these days in the case of the young. They are exposed to constant and subtle danger. We know how dear they are to the heart of Christ. The utmost that can be done for them by service, education and prayer will hardly prevent many tragedies.

V.

Our approved habits of prayer fit every condition and circumstance of life. Where there is a robust spirit of prayer there will be no lack of ingenuity in it. Where there is not a real spirit of prayer, little will be accomplished. Aspirations, ejaculations, simple little petitions for divine guidance, a decade of the rosary, all of them hidden and known only to the angels, are methods of effective worship and petition whose value it would be a serious mistake to underrate. The true spirit of prayer prompts one to the exercise of that spirit in these simple ways. There is no priest or lay person who has not a hundred opportunities daily to send such secret messages across the eternal hills and win benedictions upon those for whom they are offered. There were only eight words in the prayer of the publican as he bent his head near the door of the temple: "Oh God, be merciful to me a sinner." And yet our Lord tells us that these words coming from the unsounded depths of a repentant heart effected the publican's justification. A priest hardly realizes the imperial power in his uplifted hand as he speaks in the name of God to give a blessing.

VI.

The loss of spiritual sense, of the sense of sin, now observed so widely, seems to have much to do in creating a casual attitude toward prayer on all sides. Now prayer is fundamental in spiritual life. It is rooted in dogmatic revelation and the primary obligations of Christian living. We are surrounded by spiritual dangers of every kind. They arise from within and from without. Past sins and shallow repentance may leave us in debt to God in a way that only to-day's fervent prayer may satisfy. Obligations of prayer for others that may have been neglected or indifferently satisfied may lay claims to our present spiritual generosity. None of us know the temptations that await us in the future, the claims for courage that duties yet to come may make. The future is in our keeping now. What a lesson we may take from liturgical prayer in the *Libera nos, Domine,* when in the Canon of the Mass we pray to God to protect us against all evils past, present and future. Who is there who can with assurance say that he will always win in a struggle with temptation or can believe that there will be no unguarded moment in it when one's graces seem to be off guard and the struggle is lost. Throughout the world, Christian and pagan, throughout every life, in the life of every priest, there are needs, there are dangers, there are inadvertences and perhaps remnants of sin against which adequate protection will be found only in prayer.

In view of all of this should not every one aim to understand the partnership with Christ in the work of the Redemption and spiritual peace, involved in habits of active, earnest and wide-seeing prayer? Reference was made on a preceding page to the place of prayer in one's personal philosophy. It is only when an enlightened understanding of the providential rôle of prayer is arrived at that a substantial sense of prayer will be gained and the followers of Christ will take their place as partners in the work of Redemption.

VII.

By-products are always important in industry. They are likewise important in spiritual life. The edification given by good example, for instance, is a by-product of virtue. There are many by-products of Christian prayer that are worth considering. One is selected for a brief reference. Right habits of prayer cannot fail to react upon character, therefore upon conscience, therefore upon the correction of faults that seem in one way or another to escape spiritual attention. We meet only too frequently instances of meanness, dishonor, injustice, selfishness, offences against charity and truth that one can reconcile with difficulty with the profession and practice of faith. These faults represent in large measure a tyranny of temperament under which one is blinded to their relation to conscience. A scholarly bishop now dead once remarked that priests cause much more unhappiness by defects of character than by sins. All lives are haunted by inadvertences. The conscience by which we would cover all of our behavior cannot be stretched to cover it completely and our temperamental failings are left to themselves only too often, repeated with unwearied regularity and causing distress and disedification to those with whom we deal.

The thoughtfulness and spiritual intelligence that result from a right attitude toward the spirit, scope and obligations of prayer lead to the conquest of such temperamental failings and help one to advance in paths of spiritual perfection.

William J. Kerby

Washington, D. C.

THE CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY.

OUT OF the ordering of Divine Providence we have been conceived and born into an age which, from most external signs, will be a momentous one. Almost until the turn of this century, the world labored not only under the twofold darkness of ignorance and fallen human nature, but also under the added burden of a vast intellectual confusion bequeathed it by the preceding four centuries. Indeed, from the moment of the Protestant revolt and the renascence, when the spiritual unity of the Christian culture began violently to be disrupted, the world has rapidly divided itself from the things of the reason by the double way of rationalism and materialism. Each of these roads away from the end of man was traveled only by defect of humility and of that supernatural magnanimity which is sanctity, so that we ought not to be astonished to see men of their times put a specious trust or a profound distrust in the reason. We even find the spirit of those times cultured in parts of contemporary scholasticism, and it is the contention of an important school of historians of philosophy that what, for some strange reason, we call " modern " philosophy, is the outgrowth of scholasticism of that day.[1]

As for morals, men began to act as if one should live neither by faith nor by reason, as if the active life had not the well-springs of its being in the contemplative, as if that life did not flourish in the human being not by way of substraction but by way of addition. They did things, and perhaps rationalized their conduct afterward. Or, they acted by their philosophy. The result was the same in either event—disorder and sin. Only in a relatively few secluded parts of the world men, guarded by the threefold vow and elevated and sanctified by grace, kept the fires burning. For the rest of the world, it did not live altogether as if that learning had never existed: as Berdyaev maintains, the western world at its worst has never lost the effects of Christianity. The leaven was still alive, but the flour was corrupt.

After the first half of the nineteenth century things began to change: the intellect cannot rest satisfied except in truth. There were stirrings in various parts of the world, yet they lacked a sure method and direction. But from the time of His Holiness Pope Leo XIII, the decrees of the Holy See, reaffirmed, fortified and augmented by those who have followed him in the same See, have given back to the world its birthright in the realm of the reason. Thus we have come to the time when it seems as if the once lost unity of the Christian culture may be regained and extended to the whole race of men. With the awakening of the scientific world to the glories of medieval philosophy and the frequent references of the Popes to the Christian philosophy, the understanding of reason and faith, nature and grace has again proposed the question whether there is a Christian Philosophy. Within the past two years, besides the rest of a long and fruitful discussion, there have appeared two important works by acknowledged authorities affirming that there is. Professor Etienne Gilson in his Gifford lectures,[2] speaking from a wealth of knowledge in the history of philosophy, has shown the origin and direction of the stream of thought that may properly be called Christian. Jacques Maritain has come to the same conclusions from the understanding of St. Thomas's classic exposition of the relation between faith and reason.[3] I have not the temerity to attempt to enlighten their clarity, or deepen their profundity, or rectify their truth. It is rather my intention to present a few notes in the hope that the reader may follow the injunction of our Holy Father: *Go to Thomas.*[4]

---

[1] See, for example, Prof. E. Gilson's *Etudes sur le rôle de la pensée médiévale dans la formation du système cartésien,* Paris, 1930.

The very notion of there being such a thing as a Christian philosophy is attacked by two schools of thought, one by way of contradiction, the other by way of absorption. According to the former, not only is the distinction between reason and faith made one of perfect independence, with each order perfectly set off from the other, but the two are wholly unrelated to each other; and the very idea *Christian Philosophy* is of the same sort as the idea *square circle*. The doctrine has had a wide vogue, though, as we shall later indicate, its opponents do not show

---

[2] *L'Esprit de la Philosophie Médiévale*, Paris, v. I and v. II, 1932.

[3] "De la notion de philosophie chrétienne", *Revue Neo-Scolastique*, Mai, 1932. The text of these conferences, given at the University of Louvain, greatly augmented and with additional notes, has been published by Desclée, DeBrouwer et Cie, *De la philosophie chrétienne*, 1933. In the course of this article we shall refer to the former, since it is for the moment more readily accessible to our readers.

[4] Pope Pius XI, Encyclical, *Studiorum Ducem*.

how they can reconcile themselves with the decrees of the Vatican Council. As an example, we recall a manual used a decade ago, in which Suarez was praised for being the first completely to separate philosophy and theology. And in that statement we believe is embodied a great misunderstanding of the whole Christian spirit as well as of Father Suarez, who is truly innocent of the crime charged against him.

According to the other school, the giving of a Christian revelation removed all natural work, man ceased to be human, and in the process philosophy acquired a " new nature, new principles, and a new light of its own ". This attitude, never found among Christians before Luther, and contrary to the whole Christian tradition,[5] in effect does not differ from the former and is drawn from the same misconception of truth.

In the resolution of the problem it is evident that philosophy cannot be the sole judge, since philosophy can decide only about itself, but not about its being actually Christian. As a matter of fact, it is only in the light of faith that philosophy has risen to the concept of its principles finding their realization in an order eminently higher than the envisioned state of nature. Yet, this very concept, it would seem, is not above the province of the reason but is attainable by it. And in the light of this discussion the further problem rises of whether there has ever been philosophy definitely Christian, a problem which is really bound up with the consideration of the criteria of the Christian philosophy. The two fortify each other, for in the light of the criteria the historian judges, and the historian in turn enlightens the doctor, for he singles out that which Christians have assimilated and used of natural wisdom in the leading of the peculiarly Christian life.

I.

Among the other human sciences philosophy occupies a unique place by reason of which it alone is able to be called natural wisdom in a pure sense. This character it derives both from the nature of the object it considers and from the unique place it holds in the order of purely human activity. Like other human operations, philosophy is specified by its object; and like all human knowledge it considers things *sub ratione entis.* But to no other science does the very entity of things present itself, and philosophy, that thing of the intellect, in becoming one in nature with the very springs of being, by such manner of participation is elevated beyond all other natural knowledge. This elevation, which is at once also an abstraction from sensible matter, derives from the contemplation of those verities which are separated from matter not only according to the existence they have in the human reason but as well according to their own act of being.[6] In so wedding itself to the very nature of being, philosophy has of all natural human things the clearest title to truth, and indeed imparts to other human sciences what they have of certitude and possess by a certain sharing. Wherefore it is the rule and measure of the rest, their mistress. In this manner philosophy is altogether rational: it deals with an order of objects by nature knowable with respect to the reason, and it is not dependent on faith " in its object, its principles, or its methods."[7] (In considering the nature of philosophy we must never forget the weakness of the human intellect and the heartbreaking attempts of men for centuries to erect a natural wisdom.)

---

[5] Cf. Gilson, *L'Esprit de la Phil. Méd.*, v. II, p. 221: "Ni les Juifs, ni les Romains à qui l'Evangile était prêché, n'avaient cru que cette predication signifiat le négation de la nature, même déchue, ou la négation correlative de libre arbitre. . . . Avec le Réforme, apparait pour la première fois cette conception radicale d'une grâce qui sauve l'homme sans le changer, d'une justice qui rachète la nature corrompue sans la restaurer, d'un Christ qui pardonne au pécheur les blessures qu'il s'est faites, mais ne les guérit pas."

But the nature of philosophy's object — *ipsum solum ens commune*—is immediately a sign to us that such wisdom exists only by reason of an abstraction from the subject or state in which that object is outside the mind. Philosophy can talk accurately of the nature of man: it cannot of itself say whether that nature is fallen, or elevated, or that it simply is. In this manner philosophy has been born and continues to flourish, though the state of pure nature is something which, for man, has never existed. In virtue of this abstraction philosophy is saved, for its dicta do not go beyond affirming the *ratio formalis objecti;* whatever there is over and above this in the *material object* is foreign to philosophy.[8] The distinction between

[6] " Non solum secundum rationem, sicut mathematica, sed etiam secundum esse, sicut Deus et intelligentiae." St. Thomas, *Proemium in Metaph.*

[7] Maritain, *op. cit.*, p. 163.

[8] St. Thomas, *Summa Theologica*, IIa IIae, q. 1, a. 1, corp.

objects of knowledge is indispensable for a perception of what we mean by the Christian philosophy.

Like all things of the understanding, philosophy can be considered according as it is a certain dynamism of the spirit by which the object has its *esse* in us, or according as it is a real thing in us.[9] When we talk of the nature of philosophy as a wisdom, specified by an intelligible object and compared to things as the measured to the measure, we have not said anything of its state in man: it is by considering the latter that we come to understand what we mean by the Christian philosophy.

While philosophy is perfectly autonomous in the sense that by following its nature of expressing being, it is self-ruled at the very time that it is ruled by the object, just the same in its human state men are well aware that their natural wisdom needs much rectification. It requires " une ascèse non seulement de la raison mais du cœur ". This sort of feebleness is not unknown to Christians: it is the sign of the great need and fitness for positive revelation.[10] In many of the great philosophies up to the middle ages we find this strain; frequently it is positively expressed.[11] For us who are aware of the Fall, and all is clear.

One might speak, then, of the Christian philosophy as one corrected from time to time by the authority of faith: certainly such reformation does not alter the character of philosophy nor destroy its freedom, for by different modes both philosophy and theology have the *ratio veritatis;* and so correction comes from the fact that philosophy has deviated from reality, in which respect it is not free.[12] For in the very being of things is

[9] Cf. St. Thomas, *in 1. Perihermeneias*, I, lect. 3: "Sed dicendum est, quod cum conceptiones intellectus sint similitudines rerum, ea quae circa intellectum sunt, dupliciter considerari et nominari possunt. Uno modo secundum se, alio modo secundum rationes rerum quarum sunt similitudines."

[10] Cf. St. Thomas, *Contra Gentes*, I, 4.

[11] A classic example is Moses Maïmonides, whom St. Thomas assumes when he tells of the great need for revelation, even about those things which are knowable by the reason; for their profundity and subtlety, the weakness of the human intellect, the vast spread of what is needed to establish those truths which man could cover only in a very long time, the indisposition to learning which some have "propter privatem complexionis," and pre-occupation in providing the necessities of life. "Unde patet quod salubriter est hominibus via fidei provisa, per quam patet omnibus facilis aditus ad salutem secundum quodcumque tempus." *De Veritate*, XIV, 10, resp.

[12] "Sicut autem esse creatum quantum est de se vanum et defectibile nisi contineatur ab ente increato, ita omnis creata veritas defectibilis est, nisi quatenus per veritatem increatam rectificatur." *Op. cit.*, XIV, 8, resp.

implanted the character of truth, so that they are unwavering signs of God, Subsistent Truth. But these signs may be neglected by men; and so Providence who has poured out before us the riches of being and set us in the midst of things more proximately proportioned to our understanding, has out of its goodness bestowed far more on us by the gift of faith. In the touching words of St. Thomas, God is like the master who, seeing that his pupils heeded not his words, chose further ones that they may see what he has in his heart.[13]

But for the moment let us pass to the clearer titles in virtue of which human wisdom could call itself Christian.

A rich treasure for the believer is the understanding that human nature has been restored and elevated through the merit of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that, given a surpassingly higher life, it yet remains human, for grace does not destroy, but *gratia supponit naturam;* and so all our activity, especially the activity of the spirit which is life *par excellence,* shares in that elevation, even to the intellect and will, raised, confirmed, perfected by faith, hope and charity. "For God has not endowed the human mind with reason to no purpose, and the added light of faith, far from extinguishing or diminishing the vigor of the mind, on the contrary rather perfects it and by increasing its strength makes it more capable of comprehending higher things." [14] In the change it still remains of the nature of philosophy to consider the same object, though its state in man is profoundly different. Both philosophy and theology have their proper objects, each has its proper source; yet, remaining distinct, there is between them that profound relation which belongs to the order of the *perficiens* and the *perfectibile.*[15]

---

[13] "Sicut discipulus pervenit ad cognoscendum magistri sapientiam per verba, quae ab ipso audit, ita homo poterat ad cognoscendum Dei sapientiam, per creaturas ab ipso factas inspiciendo pervenire, secundum illud Rom. I. *Invisibilia Dei, per ea quae facta sunt intellecta conspiciuntur.* Sed homo, propter sui cordis vanitatem a rectitudine divinae cognitionis deviavit. Unde dicitur Io. I. *In mundo erat, et mundus per ipsum factus est, et mundus eum non cognovit.* Et ideo Deus, per quaedam alia ad sui cognitionem salutiferam fideles adduxit, quae in ipsis rationibus creaturarum non inveniuntur, propter quod a mundanis hominibus, qui solas humanarum rerum considerant rationes, reputantur stulta. Et huiusmodi sunt fidei documenta. Et est simile si aliquis magister considerans sensum suum ab auditoribus non accipi, per verba quae protulit, studet aliis verbis uti, per quae possit manifestare quod habet in corde." *In I epist. S. Pauli ad Cor.*, c. I, lect. 3.

[14] Pope Leo XIII, Encyclical, *Aeterni Patris.*

[15] "Sic enim fides supponit cognitionem naturalem, sicut gratia naturam, et ut perfectio perfectibile." St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.*, I, 2, 2, ad 1.

"Cette relation n'est pas accidentelle, elle résulte de la nature même de la doctrine et de la vie chrétiennes, des renforcements externes et internes qu'elles apportent à la raison." [16] Out of this great relation between human wisdom and faith [17] (when shall we have thanked God enough for it?) it would seem comes the possibility of the elevation and the illumination of the reason, and its being able to serve as a handmaid to theology. For the word of God, deriving purely from the pure source of the First Truth we express in a human manner, composing and dividing. Thus arises the science, Theology, which takes its method (progress to conclusions from premises) from the manner of the reason's operation, and takes its source from God's revealing truth to us—the method which in the classic word of Pope Sixtus V is the unassailable bulwark of the faith.

And this change in our human state not only does not destroy the natural things of the reason but confirms our natural title to truth,[18] so that whatever we find in others of truth we ought to take, somewhat as from untitled possessors.[19]

---

[16] Maritain, *op. cit.*, p. 173.

[17] Those who deny this relation, who divide the domain of the true by faith and reason as the Manichaeans divide reality by good and evil, who preach that religion is by nature something foreign to intellectuality, are like those who in morals declare that religion and, say, business must be kept apart. "Let religion have its place and the rest of life its." And those who live merely to the letter and keep not the spirit of the law, who, in the terminology of St. Ignatius, have only the first degree of humility, approach that position at least to this degree, that they do not lead the full Christian life, that they barely fulfil the precept of charity.

[18] Cf. St. Thomas, *De Malo*, XVI, 2, ad 17.

[19] "Philosophi autem qui vocantur, si qua forte vera et fidei nostrae accommodata dixerunt, maxime Platonici, non solum formidanda non sunt, sed ab eis tamquam iniustis possessoribus in usum nostrum vindicanda." St. Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*, II, 40, 60; PL 43, col. 63. This expression affirmed over and over by the Latin and Greek Fathers, made part of the medieval background (cf. *Contra Gentes*, II, 3), is the summing of the intellectual attitude of the Church to our day. We must consider however (or be forced to the unsatisfying rationalistic view of truth) that philosophy can serve theology only in so far as it is true, for the relation we have shown belongs to that order. Yet it is patent that many dicta of learned saints cannot be accepted. In offering a basis for the solution of this difficulty we must distinguish between the way in which human acts come under the rule of charity, the bond of perfection, and that by which they are under the rule of faith. Our present concern is wholly with the latter relation; and it must be said that only the truth will serve: *Deus non eget mendacio nostro.* In the satisfaction of this desire for an honest philosophy which in being true to reality will at once be true to faith, appears to us to be one of the wonders of Thomism. "Tout le secret du thomisme est là, dans cet immense effort d'honnêteté intellectuelle pour reconstruire la philosophie sur un plan tel que son accord de fait avec la théologie apparaisse comme la conséquence necessaire des exigences de la raison elle même et non comme le résultat accidentel d'un simple désir de conciliation." (Gilson, *Le Thomisme*, c. II, p. 55.)

Then as the handiwork of the Word who illumines every man coming into the world in the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost and in the care of God the Father, we may discern a fourfold character bestowed on human wisdom. The first two deal with the enlightening of the intellect, the others rather with the intellectual life in man. We shall follow Maritain's order of treatment, to whom much gratitude is due for his brief, yet clear and penetrating synthesis.

The fact that impresses us as we begin to read the Christian philosophers is the vast and striking extension of the naturally knowable universe over the more circumscribed world of their predecessors. The instances of which we make brief mention are classic.

The dependence of the world on the First Principle, whether called the Good, the Prime Mover, the *Logos,* or the Pure Act, is common. The understanding of passive potency in limited things is at least implicit in more systems than one. Yet the idea of creation, the springing forth to actuality of things not contained beforehand in the potentiality of matter, is so obscure that to-day we are not safe in saying that it was known among the philosophies of the world. It was not that men always proclaimed the independence of contingent things—that would be absurd for them as well as for us. And Aristotle, even though affirming that prime matter was coëval with the First Mover, was far from asserting that simultaneity was based on likeness of nature; for Aristotle, the man who began to clear human confusion away from the awful concepts of actuality and potentiality, knew that the very principle by which matter is must be something else in the composite. The emanation theories are farther from the truth in assigning necessity to God's act to without, and in attributing to creatures like the intelligences a peculiarly divine prerogative. We must not be surprised that the very astuteness which had led these men to solve, at least fundamentally, the problem of multiplicity and change was a certain difficulty to them on the further road to

---

And we shall say later that we are altogether of one mind with the same authority in affirming that there is a constant current running from the beginning of the Christian era, which is a fountainhead of the various systems and which sometimes by its very vehemence throws even the disciplined intellects of the medievals off the road.

truth, since creation as we know it is not properly a change. Paradoxically, they understood creation continued and preserved in things when they failed to understand the creative act in its first instant in creatures. For us, it is of faith. Yet many have come to see it even with the reason, and so for them it is a thing *known*—which can be, for it is a truth within the just province of the reason.

Another example. We Christians are bred in the love of God; we live in His intimacy and, always aware of His actual transcendence, humility but sharpens the force of our striving. In our lives is verified St. Bernard's word: *amor nescit reverentiam.* And so sin, the personal offence against God, is that for which we have no sparing. In Aristotle, to our mind the most true and disciplined thinker of pagan antiquity, we fail to find the concept. The omission does not come from that chastity which ought to accompany the exposition of truth, for what is more serenely pure than the *Summa,* in which almost every word breathes forth the love of God?

This, then, is the first effect: for as we see that reality presents many problems to the wise man which are not even suspected by the rustic, so the same object which presented itself to the pagan understanding now is expressed by the enlightened Christian reason in a manner far more true to its proper reality.

A second effect is a sort of confirmation in certitude. It is commonly understood that those notions which are the commonest of the " common sense " are the most difficult to understand once we begin to think about them. It is not without a certain wavering and fear that the trained mind often makes conclusions. When we come to establish with the reason some of the things which are of the content of revelation, we may have a sort of retrogressive certitude, retrogressive in this sense that if the conclusion is true and the form of reasoning is correct a sort of stability is conferred on the premises. This is not an absolute standard, but taken in long use it gives not a little extrinsic fortification to knowledge. That our reason tells us something already contained in the body of revelation is an extrinsic, but not to be rejected, criterion. A familiar example is the well-known decree of the council of Vienne that the soul is the form of the body *per se et essentialiter:* which can be taken to affirm at least the substantial unity of man himself.[20]

We have seen that philosophy is a sort of life once we consider the man in whom such learning exists. Indeed, Aristotle considers it the noblest kind of life. Yet, as St. Thomas avers, life comes prior both to knowledge and to love. And the advent of our Lord, who came that men might have life and have it more abundantly, has resulted in the activity which flows from grace, the virtues, and the gifts of the Holy Ghost. In bringing men back to consider this peculiarly Christian life St. Albert and St. Thomas restored the science of moral theology—which in our lives is not split up into ascetical and mystical theology and the *casus conscientiae,* whatever doctrinal convenience there may be in that division. In St. Thomas then we find reaffirmed the preëminence of the contemplative life, but a life of radically different order from that envisioned by Aristotle. The Christian philosophy, elevated and fortified, shares in that life; it takes peace and serenity and nobility and love from it; it even helps the beginner on the road of prayer—though the doctors tell us the usefulness of its discursive activity soon ceases.

The last consideration (not basically different from the preceding) is taken from the end of man. Knowledge in man is finite; it exists by a sort of participation; and so its whole reason for being is bound up with the ultimate toward which man goes. In human knowledge itself that which is about divine things is final and is the good to which all the rest tends. But this knowledge, since man has been faced to the vision of God the Holy Trinity, has lost its character as that which is good simply for him.[21] It is not even a proximate, unless in the sense that it offers the rational basis for faith and understanding; but of itself it is not on the way till it has been placed there by faith. Then it will have been directed truly to the knowledge which has the greatest claim to being named divine since it is not only about God but is of God, the possession of Him face to face; for faith is in us a sort of beginning of eternal life; it is that by which we live while we travel the way, to be relinquished in the fatherland when we shall see what we have believed.

---

[20] In appreciating this latter problem, the seventeenth century theologians who teach the "substantial mode" (having denied that soul and body are related as act and potency) by that doctrine have earned the title to being philosophers, since they saw the problem and gave the only explanation, it would seem, left open to them.

[21] We are following St. Thomas's explanation of the difference between the *bonum simpliciter* and the *bonum secundum quid* beautifully expressed in the *Summa Theologica,* I, 5, 1.

What I have said so far, the reader can see has dealt largely with metaphysics, since that is the culmination of human wisdom.[22] It would not do to pass without making a comment about ethics and the value of philosophy as an apologetic.

An ethic, since it deals with action, is concerned with the end of man, and since it is practical (this amounts to the same thing) it must deal with men as they are. Here we are faced with a dilemma, according to which the science of morals by being non-Christian ceases to be practical, or by becoming Christian acknowledges a dependence on faith to give it that clear view of the end of man without which it cannot be adequately directive. It is true that man has never been ordered to that end which is conformable to his bare nature: yet by beholding that nature we can see what that end would be. This, says St. Thomas, is the end of which philosophers have spoken [23] (and for St. Thomas *philosophers* usually means those who have speculated on the nature of reality but who were not in the faith). From the very beginning man has been set on the long road,[24] long because it is a traverse past the whole of creation to that which is the Act of Being Itself, the *ipsum esse*, a journey not toward the knowledge and love of an infinite object by our human mode, but to the repast where we shall eat from His table, know Him by that knowledge which is Himself, and enjoy Him with that supreme joy which is His own delight: a journey utterly impossible for us to travel except by His grace and His love.

---

[22] We would say a word about logic. All the great medievals grant it a unique place among the practical philosophies, and in its domain it is on a par with metaphysics; for the great problems of reality have not been solved completely till we have considered them not only on the part of the thing but also on the part of our mode of expressing the thing. We see two greatly different schools about the nature and teaching of that art. For the one, it is a system of rules almost arbitrarily laid down and about as arbitrarily applied; among weaker men it degenerates into a sort of nominalism in which words are bandied about. For the other, it is a study of the manner in which the intellect expresses things *sub ratione entis.* Logic has little claim to be called philosophy till it investigates and justifies itself, at least in the light of higher principles. A while ago (I speak as one who lives in the centuries) it was considered that logic was indisputable; to-day it is one of the bitterest grounds of contention. In the return to St. Thomas we believe it of prime importance to go to him for our metaphysic too. And with Father Gerald Phelan, we are of the opinion that such a course is more likely to be not only clearer and more understandable, but even more enjoyable for the beginner.

[23] "Est autem duplex hominis bonum ultimum, quod primo voluntatem movet, quasi ultimus finis. Quorum unum est proportionatum naturae humanae, quia ad ipsum obtinendum vires naturales sufficiunt. Et haec est felicitas de qua Philosophi locuti sunt, vel contemplativa quae consistit in actu sapientiae, vel activa quae consistit primo in actu prudentiae, et consequenter in actibus aliarum virtutum moralium. Aliud autem est bonum hominis naturae humanae proportionem excedens, quia ad ipsum obtinendum vires naturales non sufficiunt: nec ad cogitandum vel ad desiderandum: sed ex sola divina liberalitate homini repromittitur, I Cor. 2: *Oculus non vidit Deus absque te etc.*, et hoc est vita aeterna." St. Thomas, *De Veritate*, XIV, 2, resp.

It follows that an ethic truly to be directive must not neglect the consideration of this end even when it deals with the most human of human government. What any valid ethic teaches, for example, about the relation of nature and end, about the justification of action and the like, still holds, so long as we understand that we are talking about an analogy, a proportion: for, as I have now said many times over, grace does not destroy nature; there is the relation of the perfecting and the perfectible. But to go beyond this, to assert not only the analogy but the mode which is between this perfectible (nature) and that perfection (the end which has never, in fact, been the ultimate end of man) is to invite error. It is not hard to see the difficulty for a true ethic outside the Church, since man wants to be assured of a definite end, and lacking faith to give him such certitude, tends to set up for himself an end of pure nature—that which has no existence outside of our concept. For attempting to judge all things by the rule of human knowledge St. Thomas says St. Paul chided the Greeks (and in them all the Gentiles).

In the consideration of this end I have just said that reason will either rest secure in the faith of the Beatific Vision or will have to say that in general the end of man is happiness without assigning a character to that beatitude. And so moral philosophy in the strict sense is incomplete; it needs faith to make it perfectly practical, since it of necessity deals with the actual, the concrete. But ethics still considers and can judge about what can be regulated or ordered by the reason. Its very insufficiency to be completely regulative is one of the great rational signs for the fitness for revelation.

---

[24] ". . . dicendum, quod ab ipsa prima institutione natura humana est ordinata in finem beatitudinis, non quasi in finem debitum homini secundum naturam eius, sed sola ex divina liberalitate. Et ideo non oportet, quod principia naturae sufficiant ad finem illum consequendum, nisi fuerint adiuta donis superadditis ex divina liberalitate." *Op. cit.*, XIV, 10, ad 2.

I should like to illustrate the point by an example taken from the desires of men; what I say in this section I would have understood only as an opinion, which I believe, however, can be found reflected in the writings of the great Christian thinkers. In some philosophy manuals one finds an argument like this: man's desires are infinite; there is need and fitness for their satisfaction; since only the Beatific Vision will fill these desires to completeness, the end of man must be the Beatific Vision. (I refer here not to the general arguments about beatitude, but to those which conclude to the satisfaction not only by an infinite *object,* but in an infinite *manner.*) It is an inference which I believe is near to being formally true (of course, every statement in it is in fact true), but which cannot be purely rational, since some of its principles are outside the domain of the reason. As for the infinity of man's longing, this is evidence which of itself is taken from the concrete, the state of man. It is easy to grant infinite desires in the sense of longing to know and possess God in a natural manner. But in us Christians there is the wanting not merely to know God discursively, that knowledge growing fuller as life progresses, but to behold Him face to face. Practically all the authorities on the spiritual life, especially that master St. John of the Cross, assert that this desire grows more ardent and the thirst increases the deeper grows our faith, the more we drink in of the love of God. It would seem, then, that such longing is implanted in us by God, not in our nature simply, but in our nature and its faculties by their elevation; to this purpose I wish to repeat a word of what I have just quoted from the *De Veritate:* "*quia ad ipsum obtinendum vires naturales non sufficiunt: nec ad cogitandum vel ad desiderandum.*" So, in our ethics tractates, it does not seem prudent to pass over the Beatific Vision, since that orients our whole life; nor is it wise to use reason the better to understand this supernatural desire, to show the fitness of the supernatural order, of which this desire is a sign as every effect is a sign of its cause.

It is only just to reason and to faith to indicate moral theology as that which is needed for the complete and perfect direction of conduct.

The same might be applied, *mutatis mutandis,* to the social sciences which are in a measure interpretative. The historian in his work often finds it necessary to discuss the origin and end of movements, to affirm that what is new has a foundation in the old; in discussing the various complexities of motive, of the workings of the idea in the mass, he must borrow his principles in large measure from philosophy, since he cannot establish them himself. And at the price of being always incomplete and often inaccurate does he neglect revelation. He is not writing history if he forgets grace: *history is written first in the Divine Providence.*

It becomes evident that philosophy has great value in apologetics (not as an apologetic), but that it is not the principal end nor the chief means. It lays a foundation for faith: it helps in the negative understanding we may gain of its mysteries. In solving the universal problems of being, the Christian philosophy, in a manner of speaking, may clear the way for the non-believer's accepting the faith. But it is hardly more than a negative way to belief, and it would be radically false to assume that a man holding to such a philosophy is ready for the faith in another sense than this, that he sees there is nothing in reason against it and that, on the contrary, it is supremely fitting and needful. This is not teaching in the " wisdom of speech " (and by speech, *verbum,* St. Thomas explains that St. Paul means human wisdom); rather it is using such wisdom.[25] But to appeal to human reason as the principal root of the Christian doctrine and life is not fit for the Christian faith: it is making void the cross of Christ.[26] We can only bring one to the feet of Christ, and when the truths of faith will have been taught him, hope and pray that in God's mercy and grace he may be brought to sing with us in the Church: *O Crux ave spes unica.*

[25] " Dicendum est ergo, quod aliud est docere in sapientia verbi quocumque modo intelligatur, et aliud uti sapientia verbi in docendo. Ille in sapientia verbi docet, qui sapientiam verbi accipit pro principali radice suae doctrinae, ita scilicet quod ea solum approbet, quae verbi sapientiam continent: reprobet autem ea quae sapientiam verbi non habent, et hoc fidei est corruptivum. Utitur autem sapientia verbi, qui suppositis vere fidei fundamentis, si qua vera in doctrinis philosophorum inveniat, in obsequium fidei assumit." In *I Cor.*, I, lect. 3.

[26] " Qui autem principaliter innititur in docendo sapientiam verbi, quantum in se est, evacuat crucem Christi. Ergo docere in sapientia verbi non est modus conveniens fidei Christianae, hoc est, ergo quod dicit: *Ut non evacuetur crux Christi.*"—*Ibid.*

II.

Another question is this: Is there any criterion for determining the Christian philosophy?

The prime standard by which any enunciation is measured is truth: for that which is a finite expression of what is or what is not is true by way of participation: and its being true depends on the True as cause, as really as its being depends on Being Itself as a cause. It is difficult to express our meaning in other language without watering it down. It may be more enlightening to the reader who has not had the opportunity of meditating on participation, the true, being, God, creature, and causality, to say that as God, the First Cause, is the source and measure of all limited things, so God, the First True, is the source and measure of all finite truth, whether that implanted in the being of creatures (sometimes called " ontological truth ") or that which is uttered by the finite intellect.[27]

Both philosophy and theology (considered as a human expression of peculiarly divine truth) are measured ultimately by that Truth, though in different ways; and it is because of its radically nobler and higher manner of being true that theology is prime in our lives. Yet in its surpassing transcendence it has left philosophy its own principles and its own methods; it does not even stoop to establish those principles, but rather as occasion arises it says yes or no to them.

We may say, then, that if a human philosophic doctrine is *true,* it is part of the Christian philosophy: at least in the sense that it is apt and ready for assimilation and elevation by faith.

A second criterion is what we may call the quasi-historical one. If we can distinguish a philosophy which historically has been a constant current through the Christian thinking, then we have already a sort of measure for what is to come. We ought to remark that thought is in one sense peculiar to the individual, and in another it transcends all such bounds. In the first way it is a life of the spirit; in the second it gets a sort of emancipation from men by its attachment to the object. And so a philosophic system is not made by juxtaposition—so is a barrel of apples constituted—but only by assimilation. After Maritain's word, nothing is so voracious as pure thought. And so, to believe that any sort of doctrine jumbled together with quotations from authorities is a living whole, is to fall into error. St. Augustine himself declares that when many masters are forbidden, one must understand that many masters teaching contrary doctrines are forbidden: for, so to speak, mere plurality of doctors may be a sort of unity in the truth. (We might meditate that they are one under Christ, the Word, our sole master.)

---

[27] This cardinal epistemological principle is not peculiar to Thomism solely, but to the whole Christian philosophy—though we are not intending to put any distinction between the two; without it it would seem futile to try to solve the critical problem satisfactorily; cf. Gilson, *op. cit.*, v. II, c. 3; St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.*, I, 16, 5; *De Verit.*, I, 2 and 8; *In I Perih.*, lect. 3 et al.; St. Albert, *De Intellectu et Intelligibili*, I, 2; for a very brief introduction to the Thomist exposition see Fr. Kremer's excellent synoptic article, " La synthèse thomiste de la vérité," in *Révue Neo-Scolastique*, August, 1933.

I have been of the opinion that there is such a stream of thought, invoking a special metaphysic, though mine has not been the learning to say such a thing with authority. But with the appearance of the Gilson lectures, it is hard to go against the mass of so much scholarship. And with him I think that the whole of the Christian philosophy may be grouped around what he happily names " the metaphysic of Exodus "—the understanding and demonstration of God's unique name, *Who Am.* Analogy, participation, causality, order, and all the rest find their reason and their peace here. It is also my belief that, so far as we can tell, the whole of what is assimilable in what has gone before is to be found in the work of St. Thomas—it is not an opinion on which I stand alone.

Of course, it would be foolish to try to do more than indicate my position here. It should be said, though, that among the earlier doctors, say before St. Isidore and St. John Damascene, there is hardly an attempt to erect a system of philosophy, though often all the elements for a system are present more or less explicitly. St. Augustine, for example, at his maturity usually descends from a superior wisdom to consider philosophy. A classic example is the discussion of prime matter (*De Natura Boni*) where he is not concerned with the system, whether or not there is such a thing, but simply shows that, taking it as the philosophers have offered it, it is good *in potentia*—a solution which is highly Thomistic. In this matter one is ultimately bound to accept what some have called the " method of providence ", and as providence in taking care of the whole human destiny satisfies the needs of each time, it is altogether what we should expect to see the earlier doctors engrossed wholly with the faith, explaining, defending, rejecting heresies, using philosophy as need arises, till the faith has been firmly grounded in human hearts. Then comes the need for the system; and with it comes the long distinguished line which culminates in St. Thomas.

I should like to remark that, while Thomism may have been accidental to St. Thomas (in the sense that human wisdom is an accident, not in the sense that his prodigious labors and heroic virtue and never-ceasing prayers had nothing to do with it), Thomism is not accidental to the Divine Providence. And so when we take particular delight in calling ourselves Thomist, it is not out of slavish devotion to a system, but rather out of devotion to the truth. We take this way of constantly renewing in ourselves thanksgiving to the Truth Himself for His great goodness in giving the world what has never ceased to be one of its greatest marvels. It is its peculiar devotion to truth which raises Thomism above the limits of place or time and makes it ready to assimilate what there is of truth in subsequent systems as it was the day it began to be.

The third standard is really bound up with the second, for in the decrees of the Holy See, especially considered in their harmony over many centuries, we are almost forced to see reflected the Divine direction which will never fail the Church. I shall not say more here, for the papal documents speak best for themselves, from the three Popes who declared themselves in St. Thomas's own day to the present Holy Father. As Hendrick Wilhelm van Loon said of *Casti Conubii,* when the Pope speaks his latin he does not mince words. Yet the Christian world is free; it is most likely that it will never be formally bound to Thomism, for that would be profoundly to misunderstand the divine economy. But for him who would obey not merely the letter of the law, but would also discern the workings of the Holy Ghost through the whole of the Mystical Body, the signs are there to be seen.

In closing let me add a word about the Christian philosopher.

The ancients were wont to consider philosophy as a kind of life; only a good man was a fit dwelling for wisdom. And so with a fortitude and unwaveringness that strike us to-day dumb in wonder (for they did not have the faith that guides and strengthens us) they set out on a path of self-purification not only from the things of the senses, but from all unworthy things. The rigors and mortifications they practised were, according to their relentlessly logical spirits, an obvious condition to ensure the purity and stability of their contemplative life. What the Greeks, the very few Greeks, understood of what must be done to lead the life of virtue, the vast sweep of the Christian world, down to the lowliest peasant, now understands in virtue of the radically higher light of faith. But it seems an especial work of Providence that the pure light of natural wisdom should for an instant flash in the Greek mind that man might always look to that one sole moment as a sign of what even man's fallen intellect could accomplish. The rest of history of the non-Christian nations is always present as a sign of the darkness and shadow of the Fall. For it has been the work of Christ to redeem the intellect as He redeems man. If philosophy has attained to high estate, it is to Christ that we must be grateful.

And so the heart of the Christian philosopher need be buried in the heart of Christ. He must be enfolded and nourished in the warm womb of grace. And in his veins must run the life-blood of charity. Only then will his thought be strong; only then will it be holy. For he lives by and in Christ, the Strong, the Holy.

BERNARD J. MÜLLER-THYM.

St. Louis University,
St. Louis, Missouri.

THE LITURGICAL PRONUNCIATION OF LATIN.

READERS of the REVIEW may recall an animated discussion which took place in its pages, some two years ago, concerning the preparation (adequate or inadequate) of students in our ecclesiastical seminaries, for an intelligent appreciation and a concurrently devout use of the Breviary, the Missal, and the Ritual, after ordination to the priesthood.

The discussion appears to have stimulated one priest to send several illustrations of incorrect renditions of chanted Latin to one contributor to the discussion. The priest commented on the illustrations and invited the contributor to further labors in the construction of a " short " article which should deal with matters suggested by the illustrations. The letter of the priest (who styled himself simply " Sacerdos ") has been transmitted to me for an appropriate treatment in an article for the REVIEW.

Sacerdos desired a " short " article. I may be permitted to express a doubt that a fairly adequate treatment of what is really a large subject can be intelligibly condensed into a short paper, because more than one topic will be presented for consideration by the three illustrations which Sacerdos has furnished.

Howbeit, the three illustrations will be taken up separately for comment here in as many different sections, and then the broader aspects of the question can be considered from a more comprehensive angle.

I.

The letter argues: " Now there are few priests to-day who do not violate prosody in the first words of the Preface and the Pater Noster. They say, and sing, *Per omnia saecula saeculorum* [over the final *a* in *omnia* and in *saecula* he places a macron to indicate a long vowel (that is to say, a vowel which is prosodically short but which is made long by the long time given to it by the celebrant in his chanting of it) and he continues]: " The 'a' is short, and they make it long."

Perplexity (together with probable confusion) begins forthwith, unless a distinction be made between *prosodical* length and *musical* length. A " short " vowel (such as the final 'a' in *omnia* and in *saecula*) may be made very " long " by its lengthy musical utterance. A striking illustration of this fact is furnished by the plainsong chant of the *Requiem aeternam* *dona eis, Domine* in funeral Masses. We find that the word *Domine* has only *one* note assigned to the first syllable (*Do*) and that no less than *six* such *equal* notes are assigned to the second syllable (*mi*), although both syllables are prosodically short. We find this musical treatment in the present-day editions of the chant, which are based on the official " Vatican Edition ". Priests whose studies in Gregorian Chant occurred before the reform-movement in plainsong received the official endorsement of Rome, probably used Haberl's *Magister Choralis* for a text book and the various volumes of the Ratisbon edition for the plainsong texts. Such students as these found the *Domine* (in the *Requiem aeternam*) treated very differently. The syllable *Do* had five notes; the syllable *mi,* only one note. No doubt it seemed absurd (to the plainsong authorities who were behind the Ratisbon edition) to give more than one note to the unaccented syllable *mi,* and only one note to the accented syllable *Do.* But the testimony of the medieval manuscripts was against this modern view, as researches in Gregorian paleography easily demonstrated. And again, the Haberlian idea that the different forms of the plainsong notation indicated different time-lengths (as the different forms of the notes in modern music indicate different relative time-lengths) was contradicted by the testimony of the medieval manuscripts, which gave the same melody in differently formed notes and thus indicated that the forms did not indicate different time-values. It is quite unnecessary to enter more fully into the matter here, since we now have the Vatican Edition as the definitely official settlement of a long (and at times a somewhat acrimonious) warfare of wits and of knowledge among scholars in this peculiar domain of liturgiology.

What has been said above will perhaps sufficiently demonstrate that the amount of time spent by the celebrant on the final *a* of *omnia* or of *saecula* has really nothing to do with the prosodically " short " quantity of the vowel *a.*

Nevertheless, the illustration furnished by Sacerdos does signalize a faulty manner which is, he declares, very common and which ought to be corrected. The Vatican Edition of the plainchant melodies assigns to each syllable of the *Per omnia saecula saeculorum* a single note—and every one of the single notes has the same time-value. When the notes are transcribed in modern notation, they are represented by what is called an eighth note. We thus find three eighth-notes for *omnia* and three for *saecula*. That is to say, neither the first syllable *om* nor the last, *a*, of *omnia* has any greater time-length assigned to it than is assigned to the second syllable, *ni*. The same thing is true of the respective syllables of *saecula*.

So far, then, as *time* goes, there is no discrimination between prosodically " long " and " short " syllables in plainsong. This general summary of the Gregorian chant situation is not, however, to be interpreted with rigid literalness. Certain cadences allow for some lengthening of the time-value of the final note or notes. Besides this, slight but perceptible variations of the time-values may occur as the emotional character of words or phrases may suggest. A single chanter (e. g. the celebrant singing the Preface or the Pater Noster) will do this naturally and freely as the spirit of the words or the phrases may warm his heart. There will be similar variations of the *tempo* by the choir, but these variations will be made under the direction of the leader, whose hand-movements will indicate the character and the limitations of the variations, in order that perfect unison of all the singers shall be secured. The objection that a correct rendition of plainsong must be a very wooden affair, when all the notes are of equal length, is adequately refuted, partly by the slight variations in time-length of a note or of a phrasal succession of notes, and partly by the fairly constant variations in the volume (or strength) of the sounds. Three elements thus combine to make the chanting less a song than a prayer. These *concurrent* elements are: the easily-flowing melody, the subtle variations in the time-values of the notes, and the constant variations in the tonal-volume. Properly rendered, a liturgical chant can be compared to a piece of noble oratory finely interpreted by a thoroughly competent actor or public reader.

Essentially, then, the plainsong notes have equal time-values, whether these notes be square-notes, or diamond-shaped notes, or square notes with a stem attached. Those priests who studied Haberl's *Magister Choralis*—(and I venture to surmise that Sacerdos was one of them)—must get rid of the notion that the forms of the notes indicate different time-values.

Strictly speaking, Sacerdos properly protested against the incorrect rendering of the *Per omnia saecula saeculorum* which he tried to indicate by the macron placed over the " short " *a*. But his reason for the protest was a mistaken one. He would be still further mistaken if he were to argue (as his reasoning would suggest) for a larger assignment of time to " long " than to " short " syllables. It would be a mistake to dwell longer, for instance, on the *om* of *omnia,* than on either the short second or short third syllable; on the *sae* of *saecula* than on the short second or short third syllable.

Once more, then, let it be stressed that prosody has practically little or nothing to do with the chanted rendition of liturgical texts in prose (or, it may be added, in poetry). The rhythm in the chanted prose is to be considered from the viewpoint rather of oratory than of song (in our modern sense of *song*). A good public reader of oratorical prose will provide for his hearers a combined recognition and execution of the beautiful, but not strictly measured, rhythm of finely modeled oratorical prose. After the same fashion (or wooing the same ideal), chanters of the liturgical texts should conceive of them as masterpieces of religious thought nobly moulded into masterpieces of human expression.

II.

The second illustration of defective pronunciation cited by Sacerdos is noted by him thus: " And in these six words, *Pater noster, qui es in coelis,* said and sung in the Mass daily, the rule of Prosody is violated. The Prosody tells us, '*es dabitur longa, corripe es de sum.*' The '*es de sum*' is the only '*es*' in the Latin tongue that is short. And all make it long."

In further defence of this rule for the *es de sum,* Sacerdos quotes the very learned Dr. Healy (later Archbishop of Tuam) as having taught his class of pupils in college (in 1867) to shorten the *es de sum,* and that accordingly the *es de sum* should be pronounced like the letter " s ". Sacerdos still further confirms the correctness of this rule by citing the example of Monsignor Satolli, whom he heard singing the Pater Noster and pronouncing the *es de sum,* in the *Pater Noster, qui es in coelis,* as if it were the letter " s ".

If any further confirmation should be deemed desirable, I can add the testimony of the editors of Allen and Greenough's *New Latin Grammar* (Boston, 1904), who tell us that the " s " is *always* sharp in Latin (like our pronunciation of the letter " s "). This declaration is more comprehensive than the ones cited above, since it includes any syllable having an " s " (as well as the *es de sum*). If we combine all of these views (in so far as the *es de sum* is concerned), it would follow that to pronounce the *es* like ez (in the word fez) would be wrong. But I think it is nearly always pronounced thus in the *Pater noster, qui es in caelis.* It would, similarly, be wrong to pronounce it like *aze* (as in the word " blaze ")—and, once more, I think it is often thus pronounced in the Pater Noster chanting. By the way, the Latin word *aes* (commonly pronounced like our *aze* in *blaze*) should be sounded like our word *ace,* but also like the word *ice,* if we follow the so-called " Roman " style of Latin pronunciation (concerning which, more anon).

While Sacerdos is thus vindicated in his protest against sounding the *es* in *Pater Noster, qui es in caelis* as *ez* or *aze* (instead of our sound for the letter " s "), and while I suppose the celebrant at Mass might as well be correct as incorrect in this matter, certain circumstances lead me to overlook such fine points in Latin pronunciation. I have used the word " fine " (points). My readers might be tempted to employ the word " superfine " (points).

At any rate, we have here an instance of keen discrimination in the pronunciation of Latin. And when we thus come into very close contact with the question of Latin pronunciation, we find ourselves at grips with a knotty problem. More than one very long article has been printed upon this sole theme—indeed, upon only one phase of this widely comprehensive theme. And there have been many discussions held—some of them heated, some of them hilarious—upon this one phase of a wide and broad (and learnedly deep) theme.

My limitations of space forbid an attempt at comprehensiveness. But merely to illustrate some of the complexities of the question, let me confine myself to one word in the " six words " referred to by Sacerdos: "*Pater noster, qui es in coelis*". I have here written " coelis " (as Sacerdos spells the word).

If Sacerdos were to hear *coelis* pronounced as *koyleece* (*leece* rhyming with *peace*), I think he would be staggered. Nevertheless, so it ought to be sounded, if we are to trust the advocates of the " Roman " (or " Augustan " or " Restored ") school of Latin grammarians. This school tells us that the diphthong *oe* is to be sounded as *oy* in *boy*—and, therefore, we have *koyleece* for *coelis*.

Meanwhile, *coelis* is also (correctly enough) spelled *caelis*, (as, for instance, in my Mechlin edition of the Breviary issued in 1925). I am not disputing any matter of correct spelling in thus noting the difference, but I wish merely to point out that Sacerdos might well be again staggered at hearing the celebrant singing " qui es in kyleece " (" ky " rhyming with " my ", and " leece " with " peace "). But, following the admonitions of the " Roman " school aforesaid, the word *caelis* is pronounced *kyleece*, because the diphthong *ae* is sounded as *ai* in the word *aisle*. How widespread is this school at the present time, I do not know. Twenty-five or thirty years ago, ninety-five per cent of the high schools and colleges in the United States were (so we were told) using the " Roman " (or " Augustan ") pronunciation.

But we are not through with the variations of pronunciation of *coelis* and *caelis*. I am strongly inclined to surmise that Sacerdos would pronounce it *sayliss* (*say* rhyming with *play; liss*, with *bliss*). I am also strongly inclined to think that Monsignor Satolli pronounced it as *chayleece* (whether spelled *coelis* or *caelis*). Similarly, I think that Bishop Von Keppler pronounced it as *tsayliss;* and that if the Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury were confronted with the necessity of pronouncing it, he would say *seeliss* (*see* like " the *see* of Canterbury ").

In the face of instances such as these, I think that the difficulty arising from the *es de sum* pales into insignificance. It was once the custom to ridicule the new " Roman " pronunciation of Latin by the simple process of using its method of pronunciation in familiar bits of Latin, such as the " Veni, vidi, vici " hilariously (even though properly) mimicked into " Waynee, weedee, weekee ". Thus, too, Cicero was scornfully shouted as Kikero—and so on and so on.

In spite of such ridicule, the " Roman " pronunciation continued to make headway, and was adopted by higher institutions of learning in England, Germany, and America. Indeed, it seemed to spread with the rapidity of a prairie fire. Its self-assumed title of " Roman " (meaning the Augustan age in ancient Rome) was, naturally, misunderstood by some priests to mean the pronunciation of Latin in the cultivated circles of the Vatican in Rome of the present day. That pronunciation is Italian, but it probably is the " lingua Toscana in bocca Romana ". But the so-called " Roman " or " Augustan " pronunciation of Latin is something very different. The *coyleece* (for *coelis*) and the *kyleece* (for *caelis*) is only one, albeit an arresting, illustration of what those who favor the " Roman " style believe to have been the pronunciation of the highly cultured folk in ancient Rome.

III.

The third illustration of Sacerdos puzzles me: " One other word from the Pater Noster that is so frequently incorrect: *et ne nos inducas.* They so frequently sing and say " et *nee* nos inducas ", where it has the sound of ' a ' as if written ' et nay '. I could give other examples where the words are incorrectly enunciated. But those mentioned have relation to the office and the Mass."

In this third example, I am inclined to suppose, the " nee " indicates a pronunciation of the *ne* which would equivalate the English word " knee." I do not recall ever having heard the *ne* so pronounced, whether in singing or in speaking. If my supposition of the writer's meaning is correct (namely the sounding of the Latin *ne* like the English " knee ") no comment is required, since such a pronunciation would (outside of the traditional non-Catholic pronunciation of Latin in England and in legal circles everywhere that use the English language) be outlawed, I think, by all other tongues.

I can only regret that Sacerdos failed to give us the " other examples " he refers to in the above excerpt from his letter. But I may conclude this section of my paper with the general comment made by him on his three illustrations: " It is said, ' Vox Ecclesiae est vox Dei.' And I wish the Vox Ecclesiae to be harmonious and correct. *Prosody is a lost art among the American clergy.* And I wish *you would write a short article in The Eccl. Review on this subject.* Especially *the three subjects I have noted.* It is deeply needed." The italics are those of Sacerdos.

As has been already noted in the present paper, Sacerdos desiderates a " short article " on a very large subject. Quite a large literature grew up around the special subject of the so-called Roman pronounciation of Latin. To this large literature could be added the various pleas made in recent years for a closely correct pronunciation of Latin by our church choirs—the " correct pronunciation " thus referred to being the proper Italian pronunciation of the Latin language. Not a little of this latter discussion seems to me finicky in a high degree, and I do not propose to be entangled by it.

IV.

Throughout the present discussion, I have used the word " prosody " because Sacerdos has used it exclusively whilst dealing with the *quantity* of Latin vowels and syllables. The texts he chose for comment are, all of them, in prose. Ordinarily, " prosody " envisages poetic verse, and therefore makes its rules for verse based on the quantity of syllables in order to fit them in properly to the prescribed formal metres of classical Latin verse. The rules of " prosody " were the guiding stars of the classical scholars who, by direction of Pope Urban VIII, revised the hymns of the Roman Breviary in the interests of classical Latin versification. These scholars spared some of the great Latin hymns from their correcting pens, for various reasons. In the main, however, the hymns of the Breviary were greatly changed in the revision.

Nevertheless, even in the classically revised hymns, we find an apparent disregard of " quantity " in the plainsong settings of the hymns. In our modern English verse we practically dispense with " quantity " in the words and syllables and exact only a more or less uncertain placing of " accent." We call our English forms of accentual verse by such words as iambic, trochaic, anapestic, dactylic, and so on. But whilst employing the old classical terms we depart wholly from their original meaning. Classical rhythms depended on *quantity*. Modern rhythms depend on *accent*.

Occasionally, therefore, we come upon an apparent clash between our ideas of the classical measures and our familiarity with the modern accentual rhythms. An outstanding instance of this clash is furnished by the opening line of the daily hymn for Sext. This first line is, *Rector potens, verax Deus*. Pronounced accentually, this line is in what we should call trochaic verse.

But the line is in reality *iambic* measure (as is the whole hymn throughout). In its plainsong setting, however, the hymn seems to take no account either of its classical *quantities* or of its *accents.* The melody flows along quietly from syllable to syllable as though the words had no accent whatsoever. And this fact leads me to consider how (as too often happens) the grand hymn, *Veni Creator Spiritus,* is transmogrified in clerical singing as if its plainsong melody were of modern composition. For instance, the apparently overpowering tendency is to give the accented (and prosodically " long ") syllable *a* of *Creator* the time of one " beat ", and to crowd the two preceding notes on the first syllable (*Cre*) and the two notes on the last syllable (*tor*) into one " beat " for each of the two syllables. This incorrect practice results in a modern " lilt " which is far removed from the intention of the medieval musician who composed the melody and who desired each of the five notes assigned to *Creator* to have an equal time-value. I venture to surmise that Sacerdos, because of his preoccupation with prosody, would argue that the " long " *a* of *Creator* should have at least as much " time " assigned to it as either of the other two syllables (even with their provision of two notes for each of the two syllables).

When we come to the subject of plainsong we must accordingly rid ourselves of the prepossessions that have been engrafted on our minds by our modern ideas of accentual verse and of the true value of the classical " quantity ", and of what might have been (conjecturally) the exact way in which the ancient Romans of culture indicated what we call the " accent " of a word. Did they *stress* the syllable that received what we call the *accent* of a word, or, instead of *stressing* it, did they merely give it a higher *pitch?* Who can tell us now? And if they were reciting verse, did they dispense with both *stress* and *pitch* and employ only a steady flow of rhythm? Who shall now tell us? I know that professors of Latin have attempted to illustrate, in modern notation, the rhythms of ancient classical verse, and that Alfred Tennyson also attempted to illustrate, by taking account of what he considered the " quantity " of English syllables, some of the classical metres. But who can feel quite assured that such experimentations are based on something better than mere theory?

In the present discussion, it has not been any part of my purpose to ridicule the " Roman " method of Latin pronunciation. Those who advocate its use in our high schools and colleges were, many of them, scholars of high distinction in the comparative philology of Latin and Greek. So certain were some of them of its scientific truth that they defended it with religious fervor on the precise score of its truth to fact. What its present fates are, I do not know. But a very telling argument against its use, from a pedagogical standpoint, was urged by Professor Bennett, to whose insistent and scholarly and prolonged labors the method owed a great portion of its ultimate success in America. When he looked closely at the results of his evangelization, he lamented his " success " openly and formally—and dismally. He had listened attentively, at a conference of professors of Latin who had espoused the method and who tried to illustrate its rules in a recitation of Latin verses, and he commented upon the many and wide variations in the pronunciation employed by the professors of the art. " What " (so to speak) " was the use? " One of the great results to be achieved by the method was not merely to establish the " truth " about correct pronunciation, but to attain to a form of pronunciation which would be commonly used by teachers and pupils in all lands. But if the professors gave the leading object-lessons in variation —well, what was the use?

Now it is fairly obvious that if all our ecclesiastical seminaries were to use only the " Italian " pronunciation of Latin, not only would a very desirable unanimity be attained in the world-wide Catholic use of Latin (even as a sort of *lingua franca* for Catholic priests all over the world) but as well would the *liturgical* —(and this is the idea behind the present paper)—pronunciation be fixed in such wise that Sacerdos would find nothing serious to complain of in the chanting of the celebrant at Mass or in the chanting of the liturgical choir during any ceremony of the Church.

One thing seems to me quite certain. Our liturgical pronunciation of Latin will never adopt the " Roman " method. I also feel convinced that singers, whether Catholic or non-Catholic, will not adopt the method when, for any reason (e. g., a radio-rendition of an Ave Maria), they are called on to sing a Latin text. They will employ the Italian pronunciation for the reason that they find the tongue a musical one for any kind of singing.

Let me conclude on another " practical " note. In the discussion of some two years ago, stress was laid on the part our ecclesiastical seminaries ought to play in helping the students to a just appreciation of the noble texts of the Mass and the Divine Office. Toward the attainment of this desirable goal, stress was also laid on the necessity of a good long course in Latin. I have sometimes fancied what must be the despair of boys in the study of Latin—(a most difficult study at best)—if in their years of its pursuit they have professors who speak Latin with the pronunciation of their different native tongues: if, for instance, the first-year Latin were taught by an Englishman or an American who would use the *sayliss* style; the second-year, by a German with the *tsayliss* style; the third-year, by an Italian who used the *chayleece* style; and an advocate of the " Roman " method who would use the *koyleece* or the *kyleece* style in the fourth-year class. It would be confusion worse confounded, of course. But if there were only two such varieties of pronunciation, the damage to the pupils would be great.

Such is my thought when I recall my own experience in studying Greek. At college, I had been taught in the *hoy, hy, ta* style for the nominative plural of the definite article. When I entered the seminary, my professor of Greek had become a disciple of the " modern Greek " method (I suppose it could be thus styled), and taught us to say, for the same plural, *e* (as in *see*), *a* (as in *say*), *ta*. And the two methods continued, each in its own way, through the whole field of Greek pronunciation. When I pronounce a Greek word to-day, I am conscious that my hearers wonder what I am trying to say.

No matter with what peculiar method of pronouncing Latin a student may come to the seminary, I think that the Italian method ought to be insisted upon in every class of the lower and higher seminary. In order to effectuate this with the good-will of a student who has been trained in some other method, the liturgical point of view can be stressed, since there is (as the title of the present paper intimates) such a thing as " the liturgical pronunciation of Latin." This is not wholly identical in meaning with " the pronunciation of liturgical Latin." A priest may pronounce the texts of the liturgy according to any method that he favors when he is not engaged in a liturgical function. For example, whilst saying his Breviary in private, he is not forbidden to indulge his taste or his convictions in such a contested matter as the correct pronunciation of Latin. Nevertheless, for the sake of a common and universal method of pronouncing Latin during any liturgical function (such, for instance, as the public recitation of Vespers or Complin in church or chapel), I think that the Italian method should be employed. If a student entertains high moral convictions concerning the duty of adherence publicly to what he considers the philological truth in this matter of pronunciation, it might not be amiss to argue the question with him in class (for the benefit of all the students). Thus it might be recalled that Professor Bennett, who labored for many years to popularize the " Roman " (" Augustan " or " Restored ") method, later confessed, sadly enough, that " as a matter of fact, few teachers and practically no pupils ever do acquire a pronunciation of any exactness " in the " Roman " method. He put the matter to a practical test:

> Out of some twelve hundred freshmen whom I have tested on this point in the last dozen years at two leading American universities I have never found one who could mark ten lines of Caesar's " Gallic War " with substantial quantitative accuracy. Nor is this all. For eight years I have conducted summer courses for teachers in Cornell University. This work has been attended by some two hundred teachers and college professors, nearly all of them college graduates, and many of them persons who had had graduate work at the best universities. Yet few of these have ever shown any thorough grasp of the Roman pronunciation, and most of them have exhibited deplorable ignorance of the first principles of its accurate application. Even college professors of eminence often frankly admit their own ignorance of vowel quantity and proclaim their despair of ever acquiring a knowledge of it. . . . It is safe to say that only those who have devoted long and patient attention to the subject and who practice frequent oral reading can pronounce Latin with accuracy according to the Roman method. My observation teaches me that those who ever attain this accomplishment are so few in number as to constitute practically a negligible quantity.

As to the " moral " obligation of sticking to the " truths " discovered and proclaimed by philologists, our contentious student could be again answered in the words of Professor Bennett:

So long as we retain the Roman pronunciation, while nominally making that our standard, we shall in reality be far from exemplifying that method in our practice. We shall be guilty of pretending to do one thing, while we really are doing something else. I hesitate to believe that such disingenuousness can permanently commend itself to thoughtful teachers. I have above mentioned the fact that certain educators advocate the employment of the Roman pronunciation on moral grounds, urging that it is our bounden duty to apply what we know to be true. It is equally on moral grounds (among others) that I would urge the immediate abandonment of the Roman pronunciation. We are not just to ourselves, we are not just to our students, so long as we encourage the present hypocritical practice. The English pronunciation is at least honest. It confessedly violates vowel quantity, though I doubt whether it actually does so any more than the Roman method as actually employed.

A discussion of this kind (broadened as greatly as the circumstances of both teacher and pupils and time-schedules shall suggest or permit) should prove both entertaining and enlightening to our seminarians, whose studies of English, Latin, Greek, Hebrew (and mayhap Syriac) literature as well as language ought to offer much attraction from a philological point of view.

Our outlook, however, must be rather churchly than philological, for we are priests and not pedants. Our most pressing outlook is liturgical. If the present paper had not already transgressed the limits of grace, it could well discuss the difficulties offered to " quantitative " exigencies in our recitation of the sequences in the Missal, and some of the grandest hymns in the Breviary, which are composed, not in metrical (that is, quantitative) Latin, but in modern accentual rhythm. What a mess we could not help making of these fine compositions if we read them quantitatively! The classical " quantities " hampered the early Christian poets who still clung to classical metres, and Prudentius freely gave *new* quantities to certain words in order to sing the truths of Christianity in classical metres. In the Introduction to his *Sacred Latin Poetry,* Trench commented at length on this fact:

> In the same way not ignorance nor caprice, but the feeling that they must have the word *ecclesia* at command, while yet, if they left it with the antepenultima long, it could never find place in the pentameter, and only in one of its cases in the hexameter, induced the

almost universal shortening of that syllable among the metrical writers of the Church. No doubt the opposition to the metrical scheme lay deeper than this, which was but one moment of it: yet the fact, that the chief metres excluded a vast number of the noblest and even most necessary words, and though not absolutely excluding, rendered many more inadmissible in most of their inflexions—this must have been peculiarly intolerable to them. Craving the whole domain of words for their own, finding it only too narrow for the uttering of all they were struggling to express, desiring, too, as must all whose thoughts and feelings are real, that their words should fit close to their sense, they could ill endure to be shut out from that which often was the best and fittest, by arbitrary, artificial, and to them unmeaning restrictions (3rd ed., footnote, pp. 9, 10).

I have excerpted but a slight portion of this admirable Note. The whole of the Introduction might well be read to the seminarians. They would thus be enabled to appreciate better the accentual rhythms of the Missal sequences and of some Breviary hymns. Especially would they admire the skillful art used by the Angelic Doctor in his Eucharistic hymns. He adopted the musical swing of classical metres to imitative accentual rhythms, making up for the absence of *quantity* by an admirable distribution of rhymic syllables. *Perperit semel sed leonem*—such was the brief but telling estimate passed by the great hymnologist Daniel in his *Thesaurus Hymnologicus.* The seminarians will have their estimate of our Latin liturgical hymns and sequences heightened by Trench's description of the constantly broadening freedom from the limitations of prosodical quantity achieved by our Christian poets.

V

One who discusses the liturgical pronunciation of Latin is easily tempted to apparently great lengths in his advocacy of the Italian method. Trench, an Anglican Archbishop, furnishes admirable suggestiveness in his reference to the word *ecclesia.* Christian poets, he wrote, " must have the word *ecclesia* at command " even if, to secure this, they must confer upon the word a new sort of " quantity " that violated the rules of the pagan classicists.

To-day, in similar fashion, our thoughts as priests should be broadened and deepened by the *Ecclesia* we serve, rather than be confined in the iron cage of classical quantity for our pronunciation of Latin in liturgical functions. Two years after the Instruction on Sacred Music (commonly referred to as the *Motu proprio*) had been issued by Pius X we find *La Semaine Religieuse* of Montreal quoting a pastoral of a Canadian Archbishop as follows (among other things):

> Unity in pronunciation is desirable above everything. In His providential designs, God wished the successors of St. Peter to make the language of the triumphant Romans the idiom *par excellence* of the Holy Catholic Church. Is it not important that this unique tongue be pronounced in a uniform manner? . . . The young levites in seminaries will easily master the theory and the practice of it according to the summary of the principles given in the adjoining sheet. All the priests would do well to make an effort to adopt it. It has already been introduced into some choirs and into several religious communities. It is far from presenting the difficulties one might suppose. Once it shall have been adopted universally, people will love it and will recognize its harmony and beauty.

The Archbishop was here speaking of the Italian method, and his whole Pastoral Letter dealt with this one theme. He was evidently in earnest. Writing on the subject more than twenty-five years ago, I was able to say:

> Catholic France is striving to replace the French pronunciation of Latin by the Italian system. It is not an easy task. But the French Benedictine monasteries have long since accomplished it; some distinguished universities have adopted the Italian system, and the dioceses of Soissons and Verdun have introduced it. When the International Congress of Plain Chant was held at Strassburg in the summer of 1905, the Bishop of Verdun wrote to its president, Dom Pothier, suggesting that the Congress put itself on record for the universal adoption of the Italian method.

No matter in what language were written the many volumes published as text books on the reform in the melodies of plainsong, I do not recall one (and I have seen many issued by English, French, and German authors) which failed to give space to this Italian method exclusively. So far as " authorities " in the chant or in the Church are concerned, their outlook is the same. Uniformity is emphasized, and the agreement is on the Italian method.

Let me concern myself next with but one argument made for the so-called " Roman " or " Augustan " or " Restored " method of the philological school of Latin pronunciation. One argument set forth by its advocates was thus stated:

> Third, it always distinguishes words of different orthography and signification by their sounds, while the English very often does not. Take, for example, the following words: *Censeo, Censio, sentio;* or *cervus* and *servus;* or *cicer* and *siser; cella* and *sella; citus* and *situs; scis,* and *sis,* and *cis; amici* and *amisi;* or *circulus* and *serculus.* By the Roman method *every one* of the preceding words are (*sic*) uttered with individual pronunciation, so that when you say *censeo* it cannot be misunderstood for *censio* or *sentio.* And when you speak of a *servus* it cannot be thought to be a *cervus.* And certainly this is an advantage in any language.

The writer was here arguing against the " English " method (e. g., *Aunty Mary* as a pronunciation of *ante mare*) still heard in our courts of law and, with its innumerable variations, found of old in the schools of England. His argument would be largely valid, also, against the pronunciation ordinarily used in Catholic schools of the era before (and, indeed, I think, of much of the era after) the agitation for the " Roman " method. But the Italian method would differentiate all of the words (cited above) in its pronunciation, although its pronunciation would be vastly different from the " Roman " style of the comparative philologists.

H. T. HENRY

The Catholic University of America.

Studies and Conferences

Questions, the discussion of which is for the information of the general reader of the Department of Studies and Conferences, are answered in the order in which they reach us. The Editor cannot engage to reply to inquiries by private letter.

FINE LANGUAGE IN CATHOLIC PRESS AND PULPIT.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

If the editor has no objections, I should like to use his office for a few minutes. I would invite the Catholic editors and authors of the nation to a little conference there. And, if the editors and authors will permit, I would say a few things to them in a most friendly, even if slightly critical manner. In their Christian patience and humility they will gladly accept a few hints, I am sure, that may be useful in their work.

Colossal egoist? Really I am not. I am merely a country priest who has had years of newspaper training. Writing for popular reading is a trade or an art that has to be learned. Before my seminary days—and that would make it about fifteen years ago—I worked as a writer for the *Chicago Herald*. When it later became the *Herald and Examiner* I worked for it as a police reporter. I was also employed in various writing capacities by the *Chicago Evening Post* and the *Chicago Tribune*. During my vacations I managed to earn a salary as a press agent.

Editors are usually anything but philanthropists. They show a dour unwillingness to engage the services of untrained writers. The fact that they paid me for my services during a period of four years would indicate that I had mastered the secrets of the trade. I ought, therefore, to know some of the practical aspects of newspaper work, or, as they put it, the " writing game ".

It might interest the ordinary reader as well as the clerical editor and author to know that the writers of even our yellowest journals must make a long and painful apprenticeship. Their products may seem absurdly simple, but I can assure you these people have labored and sweated to learn to write like that. It is the sign of art that it conceals its artistry.

Most of the newspaper people that I knew started at the work when they were quite young. I have heard them confess again and again that they endured all manner of torture to arrive at the goal of simplicity. The first efforts of the average youngster are dazzlingly brilliant—and utterly futile. The more brilliant, in fact, the more certainly futile.

The heart-breaking feature of it is that they have to unlearn many things before they can begin to learn their chosen work. They have to get the classics out of their system and return, I might say, to the nursery. In their college training they have imitated Addison, Newman, Carlyle and a host of other justly celebrated authors. Now they must forget they ever so much as heard these names mentioned.

It may come as a surprise to you to know that the men and women who write the simple little things you read in your daily papers are usually talented, even brilliant, men and women. You must not judge them entirely by the bits they are writing for all mankind to read. I have listened many times to discussions in the Chicago Press Club that were far more intellectual and interesting than anything of the same nature I have since heard elsewhere. For hours at a time they would talk of philosophy and music, theology and art, literature, politics, history, science, events of the day—and they had something to say on almost any of these subjects that was really worth saying.

At their typewriters, however, they are writing for the people and they must write so simply that the least educated reader can understand. There is no thought here of parading their vast stores of fascinating knowledge or their keen reasoning powers. Even a writer whose duty it is to analyze a situation or write an editorial reduces each problem to its simplest elements and writes of it in the simplest language possible. And the simpler the writer makes it, the more certain you may be that he knows his subject thoroughly.

To this day I squirm when I remember my own lessons. I had been an office boy and I was slowly being trained to write newspaper articles. At first I, like all the others, wrote them elegantly. I never used a small word where I could think of a larger one. If my chosen word were not in common usage I loved it the more for its antiquity. That was a sign, you see, that I was an educated man.

How the pride of authorishp was removed from my head by the vulgar outbursts of the city editor is a story I will never tell in its entirety. The things that were said to me in those far-off days still make my face grow crimson when I recall them. Everything I wrote went straight to the waste-basket accompanied with wild strains of profanity such as only an editor may use with safety. And he did not smile as he said these things.

" Do you think you're writing for the college magazine? Write it over. Get this into your big, thick head—you're writing for a lot of dummies. They don't get your fancy words. Cut out the educated stuff and get down to earth. Write so's the mob will get what you're saying. Use the smallest words there are. This is terrible. No! No! No! It won't do. Write it over."

I present the more printable denunciations. Always I was writing things over, not to make them finer but to make them plainer and plainer. And the same sad procession of my masterpieces to the scrap-paper heap went on from day to day. It seemed that no word of mine would ever achieve the glory of actual print. Then I took over the obituary department. I was warned that I would soon be seeking other employment if I dared to mention the " Grim Reaper ".

Now I was compelled to practise heroic restraint. But I knew the city editor was nearing the end of his patience—and a long, cold winter lay ahead; so I put the Grim Reaper at the very head of my black list. I was permitted only to give the facts. " John Brown, age 63, who died yesterday at his home, 1235 Grand Avenue, of Bright's disease, will be buried tomorrow from St. John Church, 1645 Main St. He is survived by his widow, Helen Brown, and his sons, John and Elmer. He was a member of the Moose, the Owls and the Eagles."

It was permissible to change the order of the clauses to avoid monotony, but I could not, as I valued my salary, add an expression of regret or a testimony to his magnificent character. When I had done that sort of thing for weeks I was eventually accepted as a newspaper man. The word " journalist ", by the way, is a fighting word in any metropolitan newspaper office. And the refrain, " Dumb it down! Dumb it down! " will ring in my ears, I think, forever.

Is that sort of composition degrading or uncomplimentary to the reader? Perhaps it is, but I cannot recall ever hearing anyone complain that an article was too simply written. There cannot be much resentment on the part of the average reader because that policy sells papers that people actually read. Are they being degraded by it? By the news contents, mayhap, but certainly not by the literary style—or lack of it.

Is such simplicity unworthy of our Catholic newspapers and magazines? I do not see why we should think so. I have yet to find any reason for believing that our Catholic people prefer obscurity or grandiose verbiage. They are, as I see them, quite like the rest of the people of their time and place. They enjoy reading, but they will read what they can understand. Because our papers and periodicals are religious in their nature or their origin is no reason why we may expect Catholics to buy and read them. We have to make them want them and enjoy reading them before we shall have any success with their publication.

The news contents of our papers and magazines ought to be on a higher level than the secular daily papers and magazines. There is no denying that fact, but I do defy anyone to prove that the manner of presenting these news items or articles of interest need be " high-brow " to reach that higher level. Why must we go in for complex-compound sentences? Why must we use words that are polysyllabic or technical? Surely these are not necessary to constitute good English.

The simple sentence and simple language are the distinguishing features of our modern literature. They must, therefore, be awarded the approval that usage confers. It is this simplicity that has made reading such a universal pastime in this age of the overworked printing press. Universal or almost universal literacy, yes, but not for everything that may be printed. It must be remembered that all of our people are not so well educated that they can enjoy English imitations of the Latin classics.

Education, I realize, is the order of the day. Forgive me, please, if I make so bold as to ask whether or not this is really the kind of education that educates. A course of athletics, I am satisfied, is too frequently accepted as an education in modern America. Most of the graduates of our high schools and a fair number of our college graduates cannot or do not appreciate literary elegance. I have taught English to high school classes in three different parts of the nation and I have also had sad experience with men who could boast of a choice degree. That is why I speak as I do.

Whenever I see an article written in complicated or ponderous fashion I begin to wonder what my former pupils would be able to make of it. I believe I could say from my knowledge of past performances that they would not, after reading and studying it, have the faintest idea of its contents. They would, perhaps, know that it was something about God or religion: but beyond that, nothing.

Some of our writers may seek refuge in the thought that articles on religious topics are necessarily of such a nature that they cannot be simplified, cannot be filled with stirring interest. I should say that the exact opposite would be closer to the truth. There is nothing in all human knowledge that can be more interesting than religious truth. And it can be made simple. If you only know how to do it, you can write simply and interestingly about anything. There is no excuse here for the interminable sentence or the dry-as-dust type of composition.

I take it for granted that our authors write and our editors publish their writings because they wish to teach and lead our people. If this be so, as surely it is, why not try to do just that. We can come to them directly and speak to them in a language they will understand. Or we can fly over their heads and drop down messages in an almost foreign tongue, hoping in vain that the message may do someone some good.

It is not so much in the presentation of news items that our Catholic press is alien to our people. It is in the articles explaining the Faith, controversies, historical treatises and such vital essays that we become insufferably dull and heavy. It is especially deplorable that these articles intended to be informative should fail so sadly of their purpose, because they are really a dire necessity in our day.

Experience with my Study Club has satisfied me that an alarmingly large number of our people are ignorant concerning the most fundamental and familiar beliefs of the Catholic Church. It was anything but encouraging to hear a group of people engaged in discussing that of which they knew so little. It seemed to me that each member of the group was determined to make his own pet error prevail over the errors of the rest.

Such a tragedy ought to make the priest who is responsible for the group sit up nights wondering how he can make the Faith better known to his simple flock. Our people do need instruction and they need it more than anything else I can think of. At the end of that season I no longer wondered that so many of our people drift from the faith.

What are we to expect from them when they have so little idea of what they are giving up? You might pass up ambergris in a stroll on the beach because you did not know what it was and, therefore, did not appreciate its value. When the Faith means little more to our people than the drudgery of " going to church " on Sunday, what else can we expect when temptation or convenience beckons them away from the fold? It is surely only the divinely infused gift of Faith that keeps most of the flock intact.

The remedy, without a doubt, is instruction and still more instruction — written instruction and vocal instruction. But please let it be instruction that reaches the mind and leaves an impression. How can we strive for literary elegance while these poor people are crying for the plainest of the plain? Come down, fellow scribes and editors, from your cozy nooks on Mount Parnassus and talk to these good people as Christ spoke to His flock. Give them the plain, nourishing food for which they hunger. Save the French pastry and the caviare for those who can appreciate it.

Perhaps you think I overemphasize the need of simplicity. I realize that I speak as if our people were only one step removed from illiteracy. I speak so because I believe so. I know, of course, that there are delightful exceptions, but I still contend that the vast majority can understand only the simplest terms. I insist further that among the choicer few who could understand if they were willing to make the effort, that a goodly portion of them do not wish to make the effort. Laziness, a deplorable but universal ingredient of our human imperfection, inclines us to the easier course. And many there are who will follow none but the easy course.

It is possible that my training has given me a wrong or at least a pessimistic view of the situation. I cannot see, however, that it can possibly do any harm to write so simply that the least educated can follow our thoughts. These have souls as well as the Catholics with college degrees. Because the less educated can understand us it will not follow that the more intellectual will fail to grasp our meaning. The contrary course will explain matters to those who likely already know full well whatever it is we are explaining. It will fail entirely to penetrate the minds of those who need it.

While we are talking with the editors and writers—some of them, thank God, could give me much needed instruction—it might be worth while to point out the need for better make-up of our papers. I run the risk of being set down as a self-satisfied, self-opinionated, vain and smug old critic—but I go on for the sake of the Cause.

The pages of the majority of our papers are terribly dead-looking things. The type is so often very fine. The printing is far from clear. Great blocks of solid type fill the columns, discouraging the reader at the very first glance. Much of the matter that is printed is simply "boiler plate" filler. It is bought for a few cents a square foot from a syndicate. Some of it is good. Much of it is horrible.

It will not ruin our reputation for learning or propriety to make our papers neater, clearer, more interesting. The idea that a full page of dull-looking matter indicates either learning or respectability is as dead as the dodo bird. Less "boiler plate" would give room for heavier printing and better spacing. Subheads inserted here and there in the unbroken columns would make the pages much easier on the eyes. There is all the difference between discouragement and invitation in such a modern make-up. Papers following that policy almost sell themselves. People want to read them.

It might be well, though it should not be necessary, to warn against the opposite extreme. The sensational daily papers go in for all manner of devices that reduce them to the lowest forms of cheapness. Our papers need not become gaudy with color or wild with whirling forms in order to be interesting and attractive. Neatness, clearness and simplicity are the qualities we plead for from our editors.

While we go in for dullness and heaviness in the presentation of our reading matter — presumably because the papers are religious and it is thought that they ought therefore to be solemn—we do achieve a shameful cheapness in our advertising sections. The advertising columns of most of our papers are given over to appeals in behalf of patent medicines, business cards of local merchants and professional people, announcements of sales of pious nicknacks by unknown dealers with postoffice boxes in far-off cities.

No doubt the editors would gladly welcome the better advertisers. When he finds it difficult to meet expenses an editor likely dreams of such blessing for his paper. The sort of papers we get out are not of the kind that appeals to national advertisers. The chief reason for this is that we lack sufficient circulation. The editor will tell you he has not the funds to get out a better paper that would attract a larger circulation. A very vicious circle.

The only solution to the problem is to use the resources at hand. There is no use dreaming what we would do if we could do it. We can make our papers more attractive and thus build up their circulation. If we throw out the "boiler plate" space-filler we shall save a small part of our available cash. Then we must use better type and space it better. We must make the contents interesting. In this way we shall increase the number of readers from week to week. The better circulation and the high type of paper we shall produce will bring advertisers begging for admission.

Lest it be thought that I am presenting all this criticism solely for the benefit of those of my colleagues who write for publication and those whose sad duty it is to publish papers, I would drop a suggestion to those who do neither but who stand each Sunday before a congregation and deliver their compositions orally. They, too, must strive for simplicity if they intend to do their part in instructing a muddled world. The grand oratory and the flowing rhetoric may hypnotize a congregation, but they do little to improve it or increase its size. Every word that has been said of writing applies just as rigorously to preaching.

One occasionally hears a preacher using great words and complicated expressions when talking to children. I know as well as I have ever known anything that the average adult does not understand that sort of language. What, I ask, is the use or the sense of carrying on like that? We could demonstrate our erudition, if that be our aim, by talking French or Latin. If we are sincerely trying to convey ideas to the minds of our people, it must be done, I repeat for emphasis, in their very own language. We must keep within their mental range, which is a very restricted area.

Must we, then, come down to kindergarten language? The answer is a thunderous yes. The closer we can come to it, the better for all of us, writers and readers, preachers and people. For the simple ones of the flock, whose number is legion upon legion, a new and enticing road will be opened to the vast treasure store of the Church. They will be able to accept their inheritance. For the writer and preacher this practice will produce clearness of thought and expression beyond the power of any other system.

"Write it again! Write it again!"

MARTIN W. DOHERTY.

Estacada, Oregon.

THE HIGH SPIRIT OF THE GERMAN CATHOLICS.

Before the death of Cardinal Newman in 1890 the great convert wrote of a distressing vision that was ever before his mind. It was the vision of a rising tide of infidelity and irreligion which would come on "until only the tops of the mountains would be seen like islands in the waste of the waters". The fulfilment of that prediction is evident in the world to-day. At this hour man must make a brave and definite choice between Rome and paganism, between a militant Catholicism and a militant atheism, between Christ and anti-Christ. Russia and Mexico have already in their rulers made this choice, and Germany is following their example. It is therefore of interest to Catholics to know how their brothers and sisters in Germany are facing the storm of persecution which Hitlerites, Nazites and other neo-pagans have raised over the Catholics of that country.

Authentic accounts from Germany tell of the magnificent spirit with which the 20,000,000 Catholics confront their persecutors. With the sturdiness and tenacity proverbial of the German they have rallied around their Archbishops and Bishops, in a manner, determined and cool, that will send down their lives in many bright pages of history. " The good Catholics of Germany ", says the *Katholische Kirchenzeitung* of Salsburg, " are not to be classified among Catholics as a dormant church. They pray in Germany. They pray with fervor and constancy. And they live as Catholics, with action and example, with generosity and sacrifice. Their deep spirit of faith and charity cannot fail to produce good fruits for the Church and the Fatherland." Every new law that outrages their consciences and every new incarceration of priests and of nuns only give the Catholics more vigor for open and secret resistance. They now read only Catholic newspapers and periodicals, and they totally abstain from political organs, to the weal of the former and the woe of the latter. For example, the Catholic organ *Die Junge Front*, which before its suppression had a circulation of 160,000, has now on its reappearance under the title of *Michael* a circulation of 320,000. The Bishops see with grateful souls the religious courage magnificently shown by their faithful flocks. Cardinal Faulhaber, Archbishop of Munich, " the Rome of Germany ", publicly thanked his diocesans for the unprecedented magnitude of the Corpus Christi procession of 1935. The Archbishop of Paderborn, Monsignor Klein, said in his Lenten Pastoral that never in the history of Holy Years have so many imposing religious manifestations been celebrated as in Germany during the recent Jubilee of the Redemption. The Bishop of Treviri, Monsignor Bornewasser, affirms that during his years as a bishop he has never assisted at so many proofs of living and conscientious Catholicity as are at present shown in every village, town and city of his diocese.

Even that arch-persecutor, General Goering, Premier of Prussia, wrote on 18 July, 1935, in tone of reproof that the Catholics are no longer content with their traditional religious manifestations, for " they now organize great processions and religious festivals for purposes of demonstration, with such magnificence as was never seen in the past ". Examples of the causes of Goering's lament are interesting. On 14 March, 1935, 3,000 men gathered around Monsignor Sproll, Bishop of Rotterburg, at the sanctuary of Weingarten, where the spacious church was crowded with young people, adults and old people who wished to pray at that sacred spot before they die. On 5 May, 1935, 12,000 young men marched with the same Bishop to the same sanctuary, where their numbers increased to 25,000. On the same day other myriads of youths went to the cathedral of Altenburg, and 5,000 men and women went to pray before Our Lady of the Seven Dolors, with the Bishop of Limburg. The cathedral of Munich is vast, but it could not hold all the Catholics at the devotions of the month of May, and on the Feast of the Blessed Trinity 7,000 men marched in procession carrying lighted torches and banners from the church of St. Michael to the cathedral. At Berlin many thousands of every age and condition celebrated the feast-day of Pope Pius XI, 17 February. During Passion Week in the German capital, over 25,000 citizens assisted at the sermons in the twenty-five churches of the city. The Corpus Christi procession in 1934 offered a spectacle of faith never seen before on the streets of Berlin, and since the opening of the house of Christ the King, dedicated to perpetual expiation and adoration of the Blessed Eucharist, the place is besieged by the faithful of the capital.

At Cologne, on 30 January, 1935, the ancient cathedral could not contain the thousands of the Catholics, and loud speakers had to be hastily requisitioned for the crowds anxious to hear the sermon around the walls of the edifice. At Wurzburg on the vigil of Christ the King so many came to the shrine of Our Lady that most of the congregation had to stand outside the walls. The men of St. Inghert, workmen, artisans, professionals, etc., have organized a function every Thursday in honor of Christ the King, and at Munich the devotion of the Holy Hour is marked by increasing numbers of the faithful. When the Bishops of Germany held their annual meeting at Fulda in 1934, 25,000 men were there in a torchlight procession. On 8 July, 1935, 50,000 persons were present at the solemnities for the Golden Jubilee in the priesthood of the Archbishop of Bernberg, Monsignor Von Hauak. Friburg, Munster, Augusta, Manzona and other centres signalize extraordinary numbers at religious festivities. In all these manifestations young people predominate. Cardinal Schulte, Archbishop of Cologne, declares the youths of both sexes love their faith above everything else. An instance of tyranny occurred one evening as the

Archbishop was leaving the cathedral. A group of young men removed the horses from his carriage and they drew it toward the episcopal residence until the police came and dispersed them.

At the shrine of Warmia one day in 1934 there were over 50,000 men; at Aquisgrana, 40,000; and to the cathedral of Cologne 30,000 men walked in procession. On Passion Sunday, 38,000, notwithstanding bad weather, marched to the same edifice. At Crefeld on the last Sunday of Pentecost 10,000 men made the Stations of the Cross, led by the intrepid Bishop of Munster, Monsignor Gallen. The Catholics of this diocese do not overlook the sacrileges of the devotees of the god Woden. Solemn functions in expiation of the profanations of Holy Week committed by the neo-pagans were attended by 25,000 of the faithful in three of the churches.

All over Germany pilgrimages are increasing. At Kevelear there were days in August and September, 1934, when from 40,000 to 50,000 people were seen in prayer. The tomb of the Capuchin lay-brother, St. Conrad of Parzham, whom Pope Pius XI canonized in last Holy Year, sees myriads of Catholics honoring at Altotting the memory of the saintly old janitor. When Cardinal Bertram, Archbishop of Breslavia, preached at the sanctuary of Annsberg, Selesia, one day last June, over 66,000 youths and men were there to hear him. Crowding on the trains often causes shortage of food in the restaurants, but the pilgrims take the situation serenely and say: "We are making a journey of penance; this is not an outing for pleasure." It is on record that during the Jubilee Year of the Redemption about 1,000,000 pilgrims made their way to Treviri to venerate the Sacred Tunic of the Redeemer. On the night of 3 December, 1934, a vast congregation filled the Basilica of the Apostle St. Matthew from 9 o'clock p. m. until the following morning, young men forming a guard of honor around the tabernacle. A procession of 3,000 youths to the tomb of the Apostle was forbidden by the police, and the next day the Bishop of the diocese issued a Pastoral inviting the young men to the basilica individually. In 1934, 56,000 pilgrims and one hundred processions visited this shrine.

The Catholics of Germany manifest their spirit of resistance to the provocations of the neo-pagans by great generosity to the Church universal. They are now in the front ranks of contributors of Peter's Pence, and they donate airplanes, automobiles and motorcycles for the use of the missionaries in the wilds of Africa, Asia and the frozen regions of the North Pole to facilitate their labors. On a Sunday in 1935 Cardinal Faulhaber blessed ten automobiles and two airplanes destined for those missions. New churches are being built in many of the dioceses, Berlin alone seeing the foundation stones of fifteen new churches laid in these two years. Vocations for the priesthood are also on the increase; for example, the seminary of the diocese of Rottenberg has been enlarged, but the superiors find themselves still unable to receive aspirants for admission. Nor do the laity leave everything to the clergy to foster priestly vocations, as a moving instance on the part of a German farmer shows. It is told how the eldest son of this agriculturist got married, and his father gave a dinner in honor of the occasion. Among the guests invited by the old man were twenty young men. At his speech given at the end of the dinner the farmer announced, to the astonishment of several of the guests, that his savings were sufficient to pay the educational expenses of these twenty young men who desired to prepare for the priesthood. And he advised his son to do likewise in its own good time. Other good signs of the firmness and enthusiasm for the Catholic religion are manifested in the fact that the religious orders are unable to cope with all the demands made upon them to give missions, spiritual exercises, in the parishes throughout Germany. Needless to say, the Catholics have long since set their faces against the law of the practice of sterilization, and that they understand perfectly those humiliating trials in open court of nuns and male members of orders, on charges of having " sent sums of money out of Germany ".

The fullest light has been thrown on these accusations by prominent Germans. The victims in the docks were merely paying their just debts to corporations in other countries which lent them money for the purposes of their orders at a time when interest on loans were lower abroad than it was in Germany. In doing this the pious religious were just obeying their consciences according to the Seventh Commandment. German banks, industrial companies and other business entities also borrowed large sums abroad, and the Government facilitated their payment of their responsibilities. But no effort whatsoever was made to come to the aid of the nuns or the religious men. And they just starved themselves to save up enough money to pay their just debts, but it has never been known that either the German nuns or the religious men lowered the quantity of the food which they gave freely to the queues of the hungry poor who lined up at their doors. The health of those communities suffered gravely owing to their decision to do with less and inferior food than is necessary to keep them in good condition, a fact well known in Germany. We no longer blush on reading that priests and nuns received months of imprisonment in the prisons of the neo-pagans, accompanied by heavy fines for " sending money outside Germany ". If justice were done, it is the judges who should occupy the docks and the priests and nuns should be seated on the benches of the tribunals.

What the future may bring to the situation between the German pagan persecutors and the Holy See is problematical. The Sovereign Pontiff has shown great patience so far. However, the German Ambassador was handed recently a strong protest on the part of His Holiness. The Government of Germany ran a coach and four through the Concordat signed between the Holy See and the German rulers in the year 1933.

J. P. CANON CONRY.

Dublin, Ireland.

CHURCH GOODS DESTROYED BY FIRE DURING MISSION.

Qu. I presume you are familiar with the methods of church goods houses in supplying religious articles for sale at missions.

A supply of religious articles is sent on consignment to the pastor of the church where the mission is held—that is, these articles are placed on sale during the mission and the pastor has the right to return all unsold goods; he is charged only for the articles that have been sold or not returned.

Kindly give a solution of the following case. A church goods house furnished a quantity of religious articles in accordance with the understanding noted above. On the first day of the mission, the church was destroyed by fire and the mission goods were a total loss.

In the circumstances there was no insurance protection on these goods. Legally, perhaps, the pastor can hardly be compelled to pay for the consignment.

I wish to submit the following question: Is the pastor morally obliged to make payment for these mission goods?

Resp. A glance at any manual of moral theology will promptly result in assurance to the reader that the answer to the foregoing question is in the negative. One of the most fundamental maxims covering property rights and restitution is: *Res perit domino.* Inasmuch as the church goods merchant remains the owner of the goods destroyed by fire and inasmuch as the pastor entered into no contract to reimburse him for damage suffered by these goods while in the pastor's possession, the latter is obviously under no obligation to compensate the merchant for the loss.

THE SEVEN JOYS OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

In the March issue of the REVIEW, a correspondent asked for general information concerning the Feast of the Seven Joys of the Blessed Virgin Mary and the Crown or Rosary commemorating these Seven Joys. May I suggest the following correct answers to your correspondent's queries.

The three Orders of St. Francis and all who use the Roman Seraphic Breviary celebrate the Feast of the Seven Joys of the Blessed Virgin Mary on 22 August, the octave day of the Assumption, with the rite of a double of the second class. The Office of the day is proper throughout. On the same day, Franciscans and all who use the Roman Seraphic Missal celebrate the Proper Mass of the same feast. Pope Pius X enriched the celebration of this old Franciscan feast with a proper Mass and Office.[1] At the same time in commemoration of the feast he extended the privileges of gaining the indulgences attached to the Franciscan Crown to all the faithful.[2]

---

[1] The feast of the Seven Joys was first authorized for the entire Order of Friars Minor and the Proper Office and Mass were approved by decree of the Congregation of Rites, 14 March, 1906—*Acta O.F.M.*, XXV (1906), 166-181. At that time the feast was assigned to the Sunday following the octave of the Assumption. Upon the revision of the Breviary by Pius X and in virtue of a rescript of the Congregation of Rites, 22 May, 1914 (*Acta O.F.M.*, XXXIII [1914], 199) it was fixed for the octave of the Assumption. Cf. letter of the Procurator and Delegate General O.F.M., 18 June, 1914—*Acta O.F.M.*, XXXIII (1914), 199-200.

[2] Pius X, Ap. Letter, *Dilectus filius*, 15 September, 1905—*Acta Sanctae Sedis*, XXXVIII, 140-143. This letter was deposited, as required, with the Congregation of Indulgences, 18 September, 1905—*ibidem*.

The Franciscan Rosary of the Seven Joys consists of seven decades, each having one Pater and ten Aves, and in addition two Aves (commemorating the seventy-two years of the Blessed Virgin's earthly life) and finally one Pater and Ave for the intention of the Supreme Pontiff (fulfilling the prescribed condition for the gaining of the Plenary Indulgence). Hence, the material rosary is composed of eight large and seventy-three small beads.

The clerical and lay members of the Three Orders of St. Francis use this rosary almost exclusively. In fact it forms an integral part of the habit proper to regulars of the Three Orders.

In general, the Pontiffs and the Sacred Congregations have extended the same privileges to the Franciscan Rosary as they had already granted to the Dominican Rosary. However, the Franciscan Rosary has some proper and peculiar privileges: meditation is not essential for the gaining of the indulgence, and the recitation of the Crown may be interrupted, provided the entire Rosary is recited within the space of one natural day. The Franciscan Rosary of the Seven Joys of the Blessed Virgin is the most richly indulgenced of all the Rosaries. In addition to its own proper indulgences all other indulgences which may be placed on Rosaries may be imparted to it.

Some authors maintain that the Franciscan Crown is an adaptation of the Rosary of Saint Brigid; but in view of its independent origin and traditional inspiration, it hardly seems correct to say that the Crown had its origin in the Rosary of Saint Brigid.

PLENARY INDULGENCES PROPER TO THE CROWN.

1. A plenary indulgence is granted to all members of the Three Orders of St. Francis each time they recite the Crown.[3] This plenary indulgence is applicable to the souls in purgatory[4] and can be gained *toties quoties* according to the opinion of Mocchegiani.[5]

---

[3] Leo X, briefs, *Dum praeexcelsa,* 19 June 1515; *Exponi Nobis,* 14 September, 1517; Paul V, 8 June, 1608—Mocchegiani, *Collectio Indulgentiarum,* (Quaracchi: St. Bonaventure's College, 1897), n. 713; S. C. Indulg., 20 July, 1841, n. 34—*Rescr. Auth. S. C. Indulg.*, p. 394-395; 29 August, 1864, ad 1—*Decr. Auth. S. C. Indulg.*, n. 412.

[4] S. C. Indulg., 20 July, 1841, n. 35—*Rescr. Auth. S. C. Indulg.*, p. 395; 1 June, 1866, n. XII—*op. cit.*, p. 434-435.

[5] S. C. Indulg., 1 June, 1866, n. XII—*Rescr. Auth. S. C. Indulg.*, p. 434-435; Mocchegiani, *Coll. Indulg.*, n. 717.

2. All the faithful who participate in the public recitation of the Crown, providing they do so in churches and chapels of the Three Orders, may gain the same plenary indulgence, whether they actually possess the beads or not.[6]

3. All who recite the Rosary of the Seven Joys, provided they have fulfilled the prescribed conditions of confession and Communion within the specified time, may gain a plenary indulgence on the following days: Christmas, Epiphany, Sunday during the Octave of the Epiphany, Easter, Immaculate Conception (8 December), Annunciation (25 March), Purification (2 February), Visitation (2 July), Assumption (15 August), Feast of the Seven Joys of the Blessed Virgin Mary (22 August),[7] Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary (8 September).

4. Another plenary indulgence may be gained once a month on any day of the month by all the faithful who receive Communion and who are accustomed to recite the Crown every Saturday of the year.

5. Under the ordinary conditions all the faithful who have recited the Crown frequently during life can gain a plenary indulgence at the hour of death.[8]

PARTIAL INDULGENCES PROPER TO THE CROWN.

1. Seventy years and seventy quarantines, each time the faithful recite the Franciscan Crown on any day of the week except Saturday.

2. One hundred years, as often as they recite the Crown on Saturday.

3. Two hundred years, when they say it on the holidays of obligation (even suppressed holidays).

---

[6] Pius X, Ap. Letter, *Dilectus filius,* 15 September, 1905—*Acta Sanctae Sedis,* XXXVIII, 140-143; S. C. Indulg., 12 September, 1906—*Acta Sanctae Sedis,* XXXIX, 571-572.

[7] S. C. Indulg., 12 September, 1906—*Acta Sanctae Sedis,* XXXIX, 470-571. The faithful however can gain this indulgence either on the twenty-second or on the twenty-seventh of August, the day to which this feast is assigned for the Universal Church. S. C. Rituum, 28 April, 1914, ad I—*Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* VI (1914), 196-197. But they cannot gain it on both days. Cf. S. C. Indulg., 24 August, 1864—*Decr. Auth. S. C. Indulg.,* n. 407; 12 January, 1878, ad 2, 3, 4, 5—*op cit.,* n. 435; Beringer, *Die Ablässe,* 1, n. 193.

[8] Pius X, Ap. Letter, *Dilectus filius,* 15 September, 1905—*Acta Sanctae Sedis,* XXXVIII, 140-143; S. C. Indulg., 12 September, 1906—*Acta Sanctae Sedis,* XXXIX, 570-571.

4. Three hundred years, whenever they recite the Rosary on any feast of the Blessed Virgin not indicated above. (Cfr. Plenary Indulgences proper to the Crown, above.)

5. Ten years for every good work they perform for the honor and glory of God or for love and help of one's neighbor, provided they carry the Crown on their person and have recited it often.

6. Ten years every time they say Seven Aves in honor of the Seven Joys of the Blessed Virgin with the provisions described in the preceding paragraph.[9]

HOLDING BLESSED CROWN DURING RECITATION.

All Franciscans, i. e., members of the First, Second or (Regular and Secular) Third Order, can gain all the indulgences of this Crown of the Seven Joys, even if they hold a rosary that is not blessed or no rosary at all.[10] The faithful who are not members of one of the three Orders of St. Francis need not hold a blessed rosary, if they take part in the public recitation of it in a church or chapel of any of the three Orders; [11] they must however hold a specially blessed rosary during the private recitation of this Crown,[12] except when two or more recite it together, when it suffices that the leader hold the blessed rosary.[13]

The right to bless the Crown of the Seven Joys belongs to the Minister General of the Order of Friars Minor [14] and by a latter concession also to the Minister General of the Order of Friars Minor Conventual and of Friars Minor Capuchin,[15] all of whom can delegate priests of their Order to bestow this blessing and attach the above indulgences.[16] The crown is blessed with a simple sign of the cross, no special form being prescribed.[17]

---

[9] For confirmation of these indulgences, cf., besides the papal documents and books quoted in the preceding footnotes, Paulus Stein, *Tractatus de Indulgentiis Lucrandis*, p. 67 sq.; and Beringer, *Les Indulgences*, French translation, p. 472-475.

[10] S. C. Indulg., 29 August, 1864, ad 2—*Decr. Auth. S. C. Indulg.*, n. 412; 7 August, 1889—Mocchegiani, *Coll. Indulg.*, n. 714.

[11] Pius X, Ap. Letter, *Dilectus filius*, 15 September, 1905—*Acta Sanctae Sedis*, XXXVIII, 140-143.

[12] *Ibidem.*

[13] S. C. Indulg., 12 September, 1906—*Acta Sanctae Sedis*, 571-572.

[14] Pius X, Ap. Letter, *Dilectus filius*, 15 September, 1905—*Acta Sanctae Sedis*, XXXVIII, 140-143.

[15] Cf. Beringer, *Die Ablässe*, (15 ed., Paderborn: Schöningh, 1921), I, n. 909.

[16] The Ministers General of the three branches of the Franciscan Order can no longer empower priests not belonging to their respective Orders to bless the Crown of the Seven Joys. Cf. S. Poenitentiaria Ap., decr., 20 March, 1933—*Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XXV (1933), 170-171.

METHOD OF RECITING THE FRANCSICAN CROWN.

Begin immediately with the first decade, saying one Pater and ten Aves. Then proceed to recite the following six decades in the same manner, reciting each decade in commemoration of one of the Joys of the Blessed Virgin. In turn they are:

1 The Annunciation.
2 The Visitation.
3 The Nativity of Our Lord.
4 The Adoration of the Magi.
5 The Finding of the Child Jesus in the Temple.
6 The Apparition of the Risen Lord.
7 The Assumption and Coronation.

On finishing the seventh decade say two Aves (on the two beads near the Cross) in honor of the seventy-two years of the Blessed Virgin's earthly life. Then recite one Pater and one Ave (on the large and small bead nearest the Cross) for the intention of the Supreme Pontiff.

PETER B. DUFFEE, O.F.M.

New York City.

SACRIFICING THE SPIRITUAL FOR THE TEMPORAL.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Is it not a strange thing that a member of an order devoted to religion should deliberately adopt a schedule that tends to undermine or contradict practically the whole *raison d'être* of our parish school system, and that the teachers seem not to be aware of any incongruity or the possible effect in after life of thus sacrificing the spiritual to the temporal?

Another example will illustrate a temporary obscuration of the spiritual end. Two half-days devoted to examinations succeed each other and the Sister in charge completes the examination in one day and gives the children the second day entirely free. It did not occur to her that this syncopation was the occasion of more than three hundred children missing Mass and of some of them missing Communion.

---

[17] Beringer, *Die Ablässe*, I, n. 909.

The spread of this numbing of moral sensitiveness is illustrated by the following advertisement: " St. ———'s Alumnae will give a dance on Saturday evening. John Doe's orchestra will play from eight to one."

One wonders whether these symptoms are becoming numerous. If so, we should be on our guard against the disease that underlies them.

Parochus

BOOKS PROSCRIBED BY APOSTOLIC LETTER.

Qu. Canon 2318 § 1 reads: " Those who publish books written by apostates, heretics, or schismatics, incur the excommunication reserved *speciali modo* to the Holy See, after the book has been effectively published. The same penalty is incurred by those who defend such books or others nominally forbidden by apostolic letter, or who knowingly read or retain them without due permission."

Augustine's commentary on this paragraph is that apostolic letter means something other than the Holy Office publishes in the Index of forbidden books. Must all the books mentioned in the above paragraph be forbidden by apostolic letter, and how is the ordinary confessor to know which books have been forbidden by apostolic letter?

Resp. The very text of canon 2318 § 1 distinguishes between (a) books of apostates, heretics and schismatics which propound apostacy, heresy or schism, and (b) other books nominally prohibited by apostolic letter. Whether the former class of books has been nominally prohibited by apostolic letter or not, makes no difference, so far as concerns the incurring the penalty inflicted by that section of the canon. The clause *per apostolicas litteras nominatim prohibitos* modifies the word *aliosve*, and the penalty is incurred only if those other books were expressly prohibited by apostolic letter. In other words:

1. Excommunication reserved in a special manner to the Holy See is incurred by all who edit or defend or knowingly and without proper permission read or keep all books of apostates, heretics or schismatics which propound apostacy, heresy or schism. Moreover—

2. The same censure is incurred by those who defend or knowingly and without proper permission read or keep other books (no matter who the author) which have been prohibited by name in an apostolic letter.

In this connexion it is well to recall that books are sometimes forbidden by apostolic letters—whether they be in the form of a brief, a bull, an encyclical or some other document—emanating from the Pope. To defend, read or keep any of these books entails excommunication reserved in a special manner to the Holy See. This more solemn prohibition of a book by apostolic letter is not used frequently. Usually books are prohibited by decree of the sacred congregations, formerly of the Congregation of the Index, now of the Holy Office. On the other hand, if a book that does not fall under those classes enumerated under 1. is forbidden by any congregation, even if its decree is approved by the Pope or issued at his command, to defend it, or read or keep it without permission is indeed sinful, but does not entail the censure.[1]

The prohibition of a book by apostolic letter is indicated in the *Index of Prohibited Books,* (Vatican Polyglot Press, 1930) by a dagger † placed before the title of the work.

VALENTINE T. SCHAAF, O.F.M.

The Catholic University of America.

MANNER OF PRIEST'S ASKING MATRIMONIAL CONSENT OF PARTIES.

Qu. At a certain marriage the priest asked the groom but, through an oversight, not the bride, this question: " *N. N.*, wilt thou take *N.* here present," etc., and of course the bride did not give the customary expression of matrimonial consent. However, both were directed to, and actually did say the formula: " I, *N. N.*, take thee *N. N.* for my lawful wife (husband)," etc. Did the priest's failure to ask the bride the above question invalidate the marriage in virtue of canon 1095 § 1 n. 3? Or did his directing the parties to recite the formula: " I, *N. N.*, take thee *N. N.* for my lawful wife (husband)," etc., and their repeating it suffice to fulfil the requirements of the canon?

Resp. Canon 1095 § 1 n. 3 requires for the validity of a marriage that the duly authorized priest assisting at the marriage freely ask and receive the consent of the contracting parties (" neque vi neque metu gravi constricti requirant excipiantque contrahentium consensum "). In the case submitted there is no question of coercion but only of asking and receiving the bride's consent; and specifically whether the priest's omitting to ask the bride: " *N.*, wilt thou take *N.* here present for thy lawful husband," etc., invalidates the marriage or whether the priest's request to the bride and her declaration that " I, N. N., take thee, N. N., for my lawful husband," etc., sufficiently conveyed the priest's " asking " and " receiving " her consent.

---

[1] Joseph M. Permicone, *The Ecclesiastical Prohibition of Books,* Catholic University of America, Studies in Canon Law, no. 72, (Washington, 1932), p. 227.

The Code does not determine just how the consent is to be asked and given. Canon 1088 § 2 prescribes that the matrimonial consent should be expressed by word of mouth if the parties can speak: but this law does not bind under pain of invalidity, so that even if the parties are not capable of speaking they could validly manifest their consent by any intelligible sign.[1] Canon 1100 ordains that, save in case of necessity, the rites prescribed in the rituals approved by the Church or those recognized by lawful custom be observed in the celebration of marriage. In the marriage ceremony as outlined in the Roman Ritual the only part by which the priest asks for the matrimonial consent is the question addressed first to the groom, then to the bride,[2] which corresponds to the question which in the present instance was actually put to the groom but not to the bride; correspondingly the only part expressing the parties' consent is their answer to the above question: so far then in the present instance the groom gave his consent and the priest received it lawfully, but up to this point the bride did not give her consent. However, canon 1100, as well as the Roman Ritual,[3] permits any other ceremonies approved by laudable custom in the celebration of marriage. In reality the *Supplementum Ritualis Romani pro Provinciis Americae Septentrionalis Foederatae*, appended to the Pustet edition of the Roman Ritual (1926), adds, after the above question to be addressed to each of the parties, the declaration which in the present instance was requested by the priest of the bride and made by her.

---

[1] " Ad valorem nihil refert, utrum parochus agat . . . per verba aut per scripturam vel nutum aliudve signum."—Cappello, *De Matrimonio,* (Turin: Marietti, 1923), III, n. 671, 4 *b*); " Id nonnisi ad *liceitatem* requiritur."—Cappello, op. cit., III, n. 617 *b*); " Absolute loquendo consensus matrimonialis quavis ratione exprimi potest, . . . sed verborum defectus, iuxta canonem, non videtur secumferre nullitatem actus." —Gasparri, *De Matrimonio,* (Vatican City: Vatican Press, 1932), n. 864-865.

[2] Tit. VII, cap. 2, n. 1 & 2.

[3] Tit. VII, cap. 2, n. 6.

Canon 1081 § 2 in defining matrimonial consent states that it is an act of the will by which each of the parties gives and accepts the right to the body (" tradit et acceptat ius in corpus "), etc. If the question: " *N. N.*, wilt thou take N. N., here present," etc., put by the priest and answered in the affirmative by each of the parties expresses giving and taking of the marriage rights, then the priest's request that each declare and each party's declaration that " I, *N. N.*, take thee, *N. N.*, for my lawful wife (husband)," etc., is equivalent to the priest's asking each party for his or her consent and each party's actually giving it.

It might be objected that (a) the *Supplementum,* just as the Ritual itself, seems to imply that the matrimonial consent is asked by the question: " *N. N.*, wilt thou take *N.N.*," etc., and given by the answer, in the affirmative, to the exclusion of all that follows as mere ceremonial; for immediately after that question both the Ritual and the American *Supplementum* state: " Nec sufficit consensus unius, sed debet esse amborum, . . . Mutuo igitur contrahentium consensu intellecto Sacerdos jubeat eos invicem jungere dexteras." Then the *Supplementum* adds: " Tunc primum sponsus, deinde sponsa clara voce sibi invicem fidem dant hisce verbis: *Anglice*: ' I, *N. N.*, take thee *N. N.* for my lawful wife (husband),' etc."

It is true that the question and answer preceding this part of the marriage ceremony fully suffice for a valid manifestation of the matrimonial consent, but what follows in our American practice will also certainly suffice even in the absence of the former.[4]

But it may further be objected that (b) the priest who solemnized the marriage *intended to ask* for the parties' consent only by the question which he put to the groom but failed to put to the bride, and that he did *not* intend to ask the bride's consent by requesting her to make the declaration: " I, *N. N.*, take thee *N. N.* for my lawful husband," etc., and therefore the bride could not have been asked to express her consent by the priest's request to make that declaration and consequently could not manifest her consent by it. I daresay that the priest meant indeed to carry out every detail of the American practice, but that his primary intention was *to assist validly* at the marriage; in fact he may never have adverted to the sufficiency, for the validity of the marriage, of the question put to the groom and to the bride and their affirmative reply, as is stated in the rubric of the American *Supplementum.*

---

[4] " Sed ad matrimonii validitatem necesse est ut verba, iuxta receptam significationem, exprimant consensum maritalem de praesenti. Quaenam verba importent hunc consensum, vide fuse apud Sanchez, lib. I. disp. XVIII, et seq. *Accipio te in uxorem, accipio te in maritum;* . . . aliaque similia manifeste exprimunt consensum matrimonialem. . . ."—Gasparri, *De Matrimonio,* 11, n. 866.

All this leads to the conclusion that the priest's failure to put the question: " *N. N.*, wilt thou take *N.N.* here present for thy lawful husband," etc., and her omission of the usual reply, are not sufficient to establish the invalidity of the marriage, since he requested her to declare and she declared that " I, *N. N.*, take thee *N. N.* for my lawful husband," etc. On the contrary the latter declaration requested and received by the priest would have been entirely sufficient and in the circumstances seems actually to have sufficed for the validity of the marriage. Therefore there does not appear to be any solid reason even to doubt the valid manifestation of the bride's matrimonial consent.

VALENTINE T. SCHAAF, O.F.M.

The Catholic University of America.

AUTHORIZATION OF THE BALTIMORE CATECHISM.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Several times in the recent past (December, 1929; December, 1930; December, 1931) articles and comments have appeared in the REVIEW concerning the authorization of the catechism commonly called the Baltimore Catechism. Exception has been taken to the words " prepared and enjoined by the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore." It has been stated that this catechism was prepared in about a week's time by one man, De Concilio, and that the word " enjoined " should be eliminated from the title-page. However, not once has attention been directed to the manner in which this catechism was approved. It is admitted by all that it was prepared in response to the resolution of the Council, and accepted by the Committee in whose hands the work was placed. The approval given to it was not, as is implied in some of the comments made, merely by one bishop for a single diocese, but by the Apostolic Delegate in his formal capacity. The approval is signed by " James Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore, Apostolic Delegate, April 6, 1885." This is certainly an evidence that, whatever be the length of time consumed in its preparation (and we must remember that St. Jerome translated some books of the Bible in less time), this catechism was accepted and approved by the Apostolic Delegate as the catechism ordered by the Third Plenary Council.

To suppose that De Concilio drew this catechism out of his head in a week's time is asking us to make a rather tall concession. It is more probable that he used an Italian source, one of the catechisms of Italy, most of which were based on the catechism of St. Charles Borromeo.

F. A. WALSH
Director, Confraternity of Christian Doctrine.

INDULGENCES FOR THE WAY OF THE CROSS.

Qu. Is there a daily plenary indulgence among the indulgences of the holy shrines—e. g. a cross with the indulgences of the holy shrines attached to it by the Association of the Holy Land?

Resp. The questioner undoubtedly has in mind the holy shrines in Jerusalem that stand along the Via Dolorosa and especially in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The Stations of the Cross are meant to represent those which are visited by pilgrims in Jurusalem. On 20 October, 1931, the Sacra Poenitentiaria announced the following indulgences as attached to the Stations of the Cross:

"Fideles omnes qui, sive singulatim sive in comitatu, saltem corde contrito, pium exercitium Viae Crucis legitime erectae, ad praescripta Sanctae Sedis, peregerint, lucrari valeant:

(a) Indulgentiam *plenariam toties quoties* ipsum pium exercitium compleverint;

(b) Aliam plenariam pariter indulgentiam si eodem die quo memoratum pium exercitium peregerint, vel etiam si infra mensem ab eodem decies peracto ad sacram Synaxim accesserint;

(c) Indulgentiam partialem decem annorum totidemque quadragenarum pro singulis stationibus, si forte incoeptum exercitium, quavis rationabili causa, ad finem non perduxerint." [1]

---

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* for 1931, Vol. XXIII, pp. 522 and 523.

Persons who are prevented from making the Stations in churches or public oratories, may gain the same indulgences by reciting fourteen times the Pater Noster and the Ave Maria, and adding at the end of these, the Pater, Ave, and Gloria five times, and one Pater, Ave and Gloria besides, for the Pope; holding in their hands the while a crucifix blessed for this purpose by any priest who has received the special faculties needed to bestow on crucifixes the indulgences of the Way of the Cross.

ARE RELICS KISSED OR APPLIED TO ONE'S HEAD?

Qu. Some months ago I sent a question to THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW asking about the veneration of relics. At the same time I asked the question of a professor in the Pontifical Roman Seminary, because I had been told that relics are always kissed in Rome. A few days ago I received this answer from the Eternal City:

"I forgot in my letter of last month to give you an answer to the question which you asked about the kissing of a relic. You wrote to me, 'When the faithful come to the altar-rail to venerate the relic, in some churches they kiss the relic, but in a great many other churches in America the relic is touched to one's head or cheek. Most likely this is done for hygienic reasons. Your friends says that it is rubrical to kiss the relic because this is done in Rome. Nevertheless, many churches in America do not do it.' Several professors of Liturgy whom I consulted assure me that the usage in certain churches in America of placing the relic on the head or cheek not only is not against the rubric but is even to be preferred to causing the relic to be kissed. You may, therefore, continue the American usage. The other one is very ancient, and, although a bit repugnant, it is done here in Rome."

Resp. The Sacred Congregation of Rites has never condemned the practice of placing a relic on the head or cheek of the person who wishes to venerate it. But three decrees of this Sacred Congregation mention and encourage other practices, viz. blessing the people with a relic, and presenting it to them to be kissed. (See decrees 2704 ad 5; 4059 ad 2; 4243 ad 3.)

The danger of contamination will be removed if the priest who presents the relic (enclosed in a reliquary) to the veneration of the faithful is careful to wipe the reliquary with a clean linen cloth as soon as it has touched the lips of one person, and before it is offered to the next.

A CHURCH ERECTED ON A BURIED TEMPLE.

Qu. Beneath the present Church of St. Clement in Rome your questioner saw the ancient church of St. Clement and beneath that again he saw an ancient pagan temple. Both have been excavated in comparatively recent times and are in wonderfully good condition. Could you kindly explain how they ever happened to be buried in the earth and how it happened that they were not destroyed while they were being buried?

An answer in the REVIEW will be greatly appreciated.

Resp. What has happened to the Church of St. Clement in Rome is a common phenomenon. When a house or building was damaged by earthquake, fire, wars, etc., and caved in, dust and rubbish began to accumulate under the action of wind or rain. The inside filled by degrees and the level of the surrounding area was gradually raised, as the still standing walls would act as an obstacle and the sand would be deposited against them. What had been once above ground became buried. When a new building was contemplated, the dust, mud and rubbish were packed, and the new floor spread over them. Very often, as happened at St. Clement's, the new walls were erected over the old ones, which thus became the foundation and understructure of the new building. In certain mounds and cities, the original level is several yards below the present surface, and as many as six or seven structures are thus superposed more or less regularly. When the site is excavated and cleared, it may happen that the successive structures may all retain their special architectural features. We are fortunate in thus having the three successive buildings at St. Clement's still essentially intact.

DIARIUM ROMANAE CURIAE.

Pontifical Appointments.

Privy Chamberlains supernumerary of His Holiness:

4 November, 1935: Monsignor John R. Mulroy, of the Diocese of Denver.

21 November: Monsignors Matthew D. Tierney, Cornelius M. Scanlan, John W. Keyes and James N. V. McKay, of the Diocese of Kansas City, Missouri.

12 December: Monsignor George C. Jefferys, of the Diocese of Hexham and Newcastle, England.

Ecclesiastical Library Table

CANON LAW.

One of the most exacting tasks in the whole field of Canon Law is the matter of interpretation. The application of a law is easy enough when the case at hand clearly falls within the meaning of the text. There are, of course, a number of laws referring to age, conditions, or requirements, that are comparatively easy to apply. Likewise certain prohibitory laws offer little difficulty. But there remain many laws that require the work of a skilled canonist to apply them properly. There is, therefore, a great need for correct understanding of the concept of interpretation. An interpretation of a law is not its historical analysis applied to its present enactment. It is rather an exegesis of the actual text of the law as it is found in the Code. The historical evolution of a law usually aids toward its correct interpretation and for this reason alone it is necessary to know the development of a law. But the evolution of a law must not be confounded with the actual text of the Code. Serious difficulties of interpretation arise when the canonist forgets that a change in the law was possible when the Code was prepared. It is true that many canons merely restate the law prior to the Code; it is true, likewise, that some canons restate part of the law prior to the Code. In these cases, the interpretation of the law prior to the Code can be carried over to apply to the law of the Code.

Yet even though this is the established rule of Canon Law, it must be used carefully and applied only after serious examination of the present text of the law. Obviously this rule is inapplicable where a law is either entirely new, or where it partly disagrees with the old law. Here the interpretation is to be made entirely from the text itself. At times a law of the Code may seem to be merely a restatement of the old law, whereas in fact some change has been introduced. Rapid, cursory comparisons frequently lead to misinterpretations of laws. This was evident enough in some of the commentaries published shortly after the promulgation of the Code. But the hazard is always present and needs to be guarded against carefully.

The doctrinal interpretation considered in the above paragraph is not, of course, the only interpretation admitted in law. No matter how skilled the canonist may be and no matter how erudite the scholar may be, his interpretation does not exceed his own authority. He is not empowered to give a final and definitive interpretation. In this matter the canonist does not enjoy the same authority that the approved Roman jurists of the classical age possessed. Yet ample authority is given to the approved authors wherever there is certainty of the old and new law coinciding. It is evident, then, that the books of canonists like Reiffenstuel, Schmalzgrueber, and many others must always be at hand. Many a commentary on the Code to-day would be better constructed if, instead of citing a canonist like Reiffenstuel to support an opinion, his entire text were inserted. Recasting a sentence may be an exercise, but it is not always a correct statement of an author's view. Occasionally an injustice is done which could be avoided by quoting an entire text. If the Code says (c. 6, no. 2) that old laws restated entirely in the Code are to be considered according to the interpretation of the approved authors, it evidently means the actual interpretation and not a paraphrase. This is best done by actual quotation. It is less well done by footnote citations to support an opinion.

Custom, likewise, affords a mode of interpretation. This is an old rule that is now stated in canon 29. It is a wise rule. In one short sentence a law that is promulgated for the entire Church, can, within reason, be adapted to local conditions. Naturally, not every law is subject to the interpretation of custom, but sufficient legal latitude remains in many laws to make the interpretation of custom of considerable importance.

The best interpretation of a law is the authentic interpretation. Canon 17, § 1 gives the list of those who are capable of giving an authentic interpretation. The legislator himself is named first in this list. Certainly if anybody knows what the law means, it must be the legislator. It is his law and he, best of all, can explain the norms that are contained in the law. Of equal importance is the successor of the actual legislator. He enjoys the same power in interpreting a law authentically, primarily because of his office. This is a more correct position juridically than obtained in Roman Law. In the Roman Law there was a definite opinion, although by no means universal, that a successor in office could not authentically interpret a predecessor's law. The reason was sought in the fact that no successor could be presumed to know the actual cause of the predecessor's law and therefore he could not authoritatively say what the law meant. Canon Law takes a more juridical position. He who succeeds, succeeds *pleno jure*, and is therefore competent to declare the meaning of laws even though he may not know the actual reasons that led his predecessor to formulate a certain law. The same paragraph of canon 17 permits a delegate of the legislator or the delegate of the legislator's successor to interpret a law authoritatively. The reason for this is obvious. It is merely an application of rule 72 of Boniface VIII.

In the second paragraph of canon 17 is found an extremely important piece of legislation. In this paragraph a distinction is drawn between a declarative, an extensive and a restrictive interpretation. Here especially must the canonist be alert. It is rarely stated in the answers of the Holy See whether the interpretation given is extensive, restrictive, or merely declarative. Yet it is of the utmost importance to know what kind of an authentic interpretation has been given. The importance lies in this: a merely declarative interpretation does not need to be promulgated and it is retroactive; an extensive, or a restrictive interpretation, or an interpretation of a really doubtful law does need promulgation and it is not retroactive. It is assumed here that these interpretations are given in the manner of a law as required in canon 17, §2. Manifestly, great care must be exercised in considering authentic interpretations. One must not be too hasty in saying that the interpretation given is merely declarative. It may not be such; and consequently is, in effect, a new law. A moment's reflexion will indicate how important this matter is regarding the validity of acts.

Recently an introduction to the study of the authentic interpretation of laws in Canon Law has been published in Milan. This work was written by Orio Giacchi and is entitled *Formazione e Svilluppo della Doctrina della Interpretazione Autentica in Diritto Canonico.*[1] Clear as the Code is to-day on authentic interpretation of laws, it is no secret that the present law is the result of slow development. It is true that the doctrine had crystallized decades ago so that there is no real change in the present law, but earlier canonists had great difficulties in formulating an opinion that could be founded in the Public Law of the Church and still bear some resemblance to Roman Law. The early canonists of the Church were well versed in the Roman Law concepts of interpretation of laws and some of them saw no real reason why the same concepts should not be applied to Canon Law. There is, of course, a fallacy here, but it persisted for several centuries.

---

[1] *Formazione e Sviluppo della Doctrina della Interpretazione Autentica in Diritto Canonico.* Orio Giacchi. Società Editrice: Vita e Pensiero. Milano, 1935.

To appreciate Giacchi's book a knowledge of Roman Law sources is required. Not every student has these sources at his disposal and for this reason a more complete citation would have been desirable. However, if a library is available, the footnotes will be found adequate.

As remarked above, Giacchi's book is an introduction to the study of the authentic interpretation of laws. After a chapter on Roman Law, the author writes of the development of the doctrine before Suarez. The civil and canonical decretalists are considered at length and their doctrine is expertly estimated. The finest chapter of the book is a dissertation on the doctrine of Suarez. The author exhibits great reverence for the exalted position of Suarez in the field of Canon Law. This is only just, for without his monumental work, *De Legibus*, Canon Law literature would be deficient. It is difficult to praise Suarez too highly for his painstaking and erudite contribution in the field of law. Hence it is gratifying to see Suarez's doctrine on the authentic interpretation of laws considered with such care as Giacchi shows.

The doctrine of Suarez on the authentic interpretation of a law is perhaps the clearest treatment of the subject that had been made up to his time. But it cannot be said that Suarez did more than develop a concept that Joannes Andreas in his *Glossa ad Sextum* had already proposed. Yet to Suarez is due the clear explanation of the distinction between *lex constitutiva* and *lex declarativa*. By explaining that the former is a " rule " while the latter really is not, Suarez concludes that there is actually no question of real retroactivity in a declarative interpretation because it presupposes that the rule existed and produced its effect.

This is the law of the Code to-day, although for reasons of clarity the idea of retroactivity is retained. Proceeding further, Suarez logically argues that if the new law (apparently an interpretation of the old law), is as a matter of fact more extensive than the old law it is really a new obligation. Therefore, in so far as it is a new obligation, it is not retroactive. This likewise is the law to-day. All this is treated in detail in the work under review.

Further, Suarez clarifies the confusion that existed prior to his time in regard to the propriety of a successor authentically interpreting a predecessor's law. The law is clear enough to-day, but before Suarez it was considered at least doubtful whether or how a successor could in law authentically interpret a constitution of his predecessor. The doubt arose over the practical inability of the successor in office to estimate correctly the exact reasons that led to the promulgation of the law, and to weigh accurately the precise binding force that the predecessor in office desired. These are real difficulties, but they are not legal difficulties. All an authentic interpretation means is to indicate how the law is to be received and observed. This was Suarez's solution of the difficulty. And with this established, no further question of the competence of the successor in office could be made. Let it not be said, however, that the canonists before Suarez should have seen this simple solution. They labored under a handicap. There were conflicting rules of law in the Decretals and in the *Regulae* of Boniface VIII.

A word of praise must be said for Giacchi in his treatment of this point. The author permits Suarez to speak for himself, and the quotations are adequate.

Giacchi completes his book with a chapter on a principle governing the observance or non-observance of a doubtful law, and with a chapter on the authentic interpretation by rescript. The first of these chapters begins with a study of the foundation of the Congregation of the Council. There follows an outline of the controversy concerning the nature of the declarations of this Council. The main feature however in this chapter is the author's attempt to trace the origin of the rule that a doubtful law does not oblige in conscience. According to Giacchi the origin of this rule is found in *Regulae* (11, 30) of Boniface VIII. But he adds, correctly, that the fifty-seventh rule of the same

Regulae might just as properly be assigned as a source. But even with these legal sources the rule itself received its great impetus from moral theology. It is undoubtedly true even to-day that everyone knows the principle that a doubtful law does not oblige in conscience.

The last chapter in Giacchi's books considers the origin and development of an authentic interpretation by rescript. It is not therefore a complete treatise of the entire third paragraph of Canon 17. There is no consideration of the origin and development of an interpretation by judicial sentence. As far as the authentic interpretation by rescript is concerned, the author quotes Reiffenstuel as the principle canonist who taught what is actually found in the Code to-day. Giacchi does, of course, trace back to the Roman emperors the use of rescripts as interpretations of law. But this is a matter that is gone over, at least briefly, in every text book. Of more value is the author's detailed description of the position canonists took before Reiffenstuel taught clearly that an interpretation by rescript in an individual case did not have the force of universal law. In a footnote to the doctrine of Reiffenstuel, the author, quoting again, gives an excellent example of legal reasoning (p. 70).

Giacchi's book is not a large, ponderous volume. It is a compact book numbering but seventy-two pages. There is no waste of space, and no parade of knowledge. It would be impossible to compress the matter into fewer pages. Nothing essential is omitted. Undoubtedly it is a real contribution to the study of Canon Law. It takes its place deservedly in the series of monographs published by the University of the Sacred Heart in Milan.

Two works have been published recently on matter contained in the Third Book of the Code. The first volume is Felix Cappello's commentary on the canons of Ordination. With this publication the author's commentary on all the Sacraments is now available. These are books that have always been found useful and this last work is not an exception.

The order of *De Sacramentis: Pars III de Sacra Ordinatione* [2] is about the same as followed in other volumes of the series.

---

[2] *Tractatus Canonicus-Moralis de Sacramentis:* Vol. II. Pars III de Sacra Ordinatione. Accedit appendix De Jure Orientalium. Felix M. Cappello, S.J. Marietti, Taurinorum Augustae et Romae, 1935.

There is a chapter on the existence of the Sacrament of Orders; a chapter on the various Orders; a chapter on the various powers conferred by the Orders themselves.

Next follows a discussion of the different opinions in regard to the power of the Church concerning the matter and form of the Sacrament of Orders. It is an interesting discussion and should, of course, be found in a dogmatic treatise on the Sacrament of Orders. But its place in a book that purports to be a *Canonco-Moralis Tractatus* is not necessary. A reference to this discussion might well have been sufficient. The Canon Law of the Code is not dogma primarily. Yet, having included an account of the Church's power over the matter and form of the Sacrament of Orders, Capello certainly must be commended for giving a clear outline of a dogmatic discussion. He enumerates four opinions and gives the arguments proposed for every opinion. Lastly, Cappello gives his own judgment, supporting himself with a long list of theologians, among whom may be mentioned St. Bonaventure, Billuart, and Billot. There is an honest attempt to appraise an argument and an honest admission that none of the four opinions are altogether certain. Cappello's judgment is that the Church was given the power to determine *in specie* the matter and form of the Sacrament of Orders.

Following this discussion, the author gives a commentary on the canons that treat of the minister and the subject of Ordination. In the chapter on the subject of Ordination are printed the Instructions of the Holy See regarding the examination of candidate for Orders. Very little commentary is given on these Instructions. More would have been appreciated.

Cappello's book closes with a chapter on the law of the Oriental Church. This is a feature of all the books in his series on the Sacraments.

The second book published recently is the doctoral dissertation *Ratio Sacra in Matrimonio Canonico et Civili* [3] by Edward Crzymala. This dissertation was submitted to the Faculty of Canon Law of the Gregorian University in Rome. The work opens with an apposite quotation from a letter of Pope Gelasius to the Emperor Anastasius Augustus. The Pontiff admits the competency of the emperor as the ruler of a juridicially perfect society and he mentions that the State and the Church are both supreme in their own fields. The significance of this quotation, later stated again by Pope Leo XIII, is explained by the author in an excellent introductory chapter. The necessary application to marriage is made.

---

[3] *Ratio Sacra in Matrimonio Canonico et Civili.* Sac. Eduardus Grzymala. Dissertatio ad Lauream in Facultate Juris Canonici apud Pontif. Universitatem Gregorianam. Marius E. Marietti. Taurino et Romae, 1935.

Following this chapter is a rather long account of the fundamental concept of Matrimony. The doctrine is correct and the explanation is clear, but it consists of a discussion of the ethical and legal aspects of marriage that are studied in the seminary. All of this might have been presupposed or at least condensed in a doctoral dissertation.

The next chapter is entitled " Matrimony according to Catholic Doctrine ". This is mostly a theological treatise with little more than incidental references to Canon Law. As a work in theology it is excellent. There is an abundance of citations from pontifical documents and reference is made to most of the leading theologians. In this same chapter are arranged for examination the various errors regarding marriage. Sufficient space is devoted to the more modern errors. Apparently the author is quite familiar with the books of Lindsay, Russell, and Ellen Key. He exhibits his indignation as he considers the ideas of companionate marriage and free love. There are some strong words of condemnation, but no more than these schemes deserve. Toward the end of this chapter, Grzymala enumerates a series of statements that are proposed by Lindsay, Russell, and Ellen Key in defense of their propaganda. It is well that this list has been made, for thus the errors reveal themselves all the more as contrary to Catholic teaching.

After considering Matrimony according to Catholic doctrine, the author devotes a chapter to Matrimony in civil law. In this chapter he correctly estimates the power of the State and correctly defines its limits. There is a discussion of the conflict between Church and State, but the discussion is along the usual lines followed for years.

The last chapter is in the order of an appendix. It considers matrimonial law in Poland. This was inserted as a practical guide for priests in Gryzmala's own country.

Since the author's book is a doctoral dissertation an extensive bibliography is added. It comprises mostly works in Latin, French, German, and Italian. No English works are mentioned, except those used to refute the errors mentioned above. There is no index. Altogether, a good work on the theology and the public law of Marriage, but of less worth in expounding the canons of the Code. A book to possess for the theological doctrine of marriage.

The Fifth Book of the Code is the subject of two commentaries during recent months. The first is a new edition of Chelodi's *Jus Poenale et Ordo Procedendi.*[4] It is a text book, brief and suitable for students. Besides the actual canons on Penal Law a description of the process in criminal trials is included. This is the most useful thing in the whole book. There are other commentaries that are better, but if one desires a single book to treat all the penal matter in the Code, Chelodi's work is satisfactory.

Several parts of it are worthy of special commendation. It gives a brief but sufficient account of the penal system of the Church. Introducing the discussion with an analysis of the purpose of penalties, Chelodi shows the reasonableness of the Church's position. He does this by explaining the definitions of the various kinds of ecclesiastical penalties. There is a clarity about Chelodi's style that makes a difficulty dissolve. Another topic that is done exceptionally well by Chelodi is a clear-cut determination of the degrees of power required to remove a penalty. All this is practical information and will be appreciated by the student. A third point that is worthy of praise is the abundance of footnotes. These will be or will not be useful according to the industry of the individual student. They are there if he wants them.

The commentary on the process of a criminal trial covers but a few pages. Most of the space is devoted to a consideration of the competent forum and various necessary officials. Toward the end of the book are a few pages on the methods of avoiding a criminal trial. The commentary is clear, especially in regard to the canons on outlawed actions. Chelodi closes with a list of censures contained in the Code. There is a very useful index.

---

[4] *Jus poenale et Ordo Procedendi in Judiciis Criminalibus juxta Codicem Juris Canonici.* Auctore Joanne Chelodi, Editio quarta recognita et aucta a Vigilio Dalpiaz, Libreria Moderna editrice A. Ardesi, Tridenti. 1935.

More extensive than Chelodi's commentary on penalties is the work of Matthaeus Conte a Coronata, *Institutiones Juris Canonici: De Delictis et Poenis.*[5] It completes Coronata's series on the Code of Canon Law.

Coronata begins with a review of the various opinions concerning the necessity of a legal sanction in order that a crime may be punished. There are extreme views in this matter, but Coronata clearly defines the attitude of the Church. In this he gives an indication that he will later on in his book render a satisfactory account of the difficult canon 2222 § 1 and the promise is fulfilled.

Another introductory item that shows the ability of the author is his clearly reasoned explanation of the possibility of crime by a moral person. But Coronata favors the view that this discussion is entirely closed since the promulgation of the Code. In this he is not correct. There still remain points of dispute. Roberti, for instance, denies that there can be any real penal imputability in moral persons. Therefore the application of penalties to a moral person is to be explained by referring to the common good. There seems to be no reason why this opinion cannot still be held.

Coronata is brief in discussing the coactive power of the Church. It is true that he refers the reader to his volume on Public Law, but certainly more than two paragraphs might be expected in a book of over six hundred pages.

Coronata's book is a text book. It can be used in the seminaries where an extended course is given on the Fifth Book of the Code. Especially useful is the large number of examples. Useful too is the painstaking effort to explain technical terms. The order of the Code is followed throughout and it fully satisfies the Instruction of the Holy See to accommodate the text book to the canons of the Code. As in all the other volumes of his series, Coronata has performed a service for which Professors of Canon Law should be grateful.

EDWARD ROELKER

The Catholic University of America.

---

[5] *Institutiones Juris Canonici ad usum Cleri et Scholarum.* Volumen IV, De Delictis et Poenis. P. Matthaeus Conte A Coronata O.M.C. Marietti, Taurini. 1935.

Book Reviews

HISTORY OF MEDIEVAL PHILOSOPHY. By Maurice De Wulf. Translated by Ernest C. Messenger, Ph.D. Vol. I. Based on the Sixth French Edition. London, Longmans, Green and Co. 1935. Pp. xiv + 317.

History shows that contempt for scholastic philosophy correlates with ignorance of the doctrines of scholastic philosophers. Scholastic philosophy, like the " gem of purest ray serene ", has sparkled long in obscurity. As the result of intense research of more than forty years, its beauties have been gradually revealed to students whose wonder grew with each disclosure. Maurice De Wulf, one of the first to apply methods of historical research to the texts of scholastic philosophy, has, for a long time, been a leader in this field.

The fifth edition of the *History of Medieval Philosophy* was published ten years ago. The work had been looked upon as indispensible even before that date. However, some philosophers shook their learned heads over De Wulf's characterization of scholastic philosophy. To use a somewhat loose comparison, the great Louvain professor regarded scholastic philosophy somewhat in the same way as the theologian regards the *Depositum Fidei.* To the theologian those who hold the doctrines contained in the *Depositum* are orthodox, and those who deny them are heretics. To De Wulf scholastic philosophy was a system of coherent doctrine which emanated from a mental attitude characteristic of those who taught it. Those who held this body of doctrine were scholastics, while those who held contrary doctrines were anti-scholastics.

Since the appearance of the fifth edition De Wulf continues to defend this opinion. In the present edition, however, he does not affirm it so strongly. Scotus Eriugena, for instance, is not called an anti-scholastic. De Wulf says: " Conforming ourselves to the general usage we now identify *scholastic philosophy* and *medieval philosophy.* The expression *scholastic* has once more a chronological meaning, designating any philosophy of the Middle Ages, and the antinomy between *scholastic* and *anti-scholastic* loses the doctrinal significance which we gave it in preceding editions " (p. vii). Those who regarded these famous distinctions as *the* bequest of De Wulf to posterity might perhaps think that he had called in his lawyer and changed his will. That, however, is not exactly the case. In deference to his critics he has kept these distinctions out of the body of his work. He still believes in them, as any reader of the preface and the *Synthetic Study, Doctrinal Uniformity* (pp. 268-272), will see.

De Wulf contends in the preface (p. vi): " When all the productions of the Middle Ages become known, explained and classified and documentary research shall be concerned only with details—as is the case with classical antiquity—it will, in our opinion, then be seen that, despite the infinite variety of medieval philosophies, a common doctrinal patrimony was slowly built up in the course of centuries, which thus witnessed the progressive realization of an intellectual unity, an ideal which exercised its influence upon all men's minds." Posthumous prestige arising from the final acceptance of De Wulf's distinctions would surely be a fitting reward for his long years of toil in the interest of medieval philosophy.

Individual differences in the teachings of medieval philosophers are brought out. Alongside of the synthetic method of the former edition, the careful reader will therefore find a great amount of analysis. Points established by recent research are noted. Eriugena and the School of Chartres may no longer be said to merit the censure of monism. The importance of Augustine among the *Masters of the First Period* is much more emphasized than in the former edition.

Specialists have been consulted in the making of the sixth edition. Van Steenberghen compiled the general and special bibliographies. Monsignor Pelzer has brought up to date the sections treating of the works and translations available to the scholastics. Only the best works published before the appearance of Ueberweg-Geyer (1928) are listed. But the bibliography of works appearing since 1928 is complete.

The French edition is said to be the best work on the subject in that language. As the better general works on medieval philosophy are mostly in French, our English translation is surely something over which those interested will rejoice.

Modernity has become a test of value. Modernity above everything else was the objective of De Wulf in the present edition. Hardly a paragraph was left untouched in order to bring the work abreast of the times. Many sections have been rewritten. And the success has been so remarkable that even the all-seeing eyes of specialists in bibliography have been able to detect only one or two important omissions.

LENT AND THE MASS. By the Reverend John J. Burke, C.S.P. Benziger Brothers, New York. Pp. 154. 1936.

The author of this work seems to wish to reconstruct the atmosphere of Lent as a phase of our spiritual regeneration. The liturgical seasons have been so invaded in modern times and compromises between spiritual and social values are forced upon us so frequently that the vigor of spiritual life is greatly impaired. By taking the ferial Masses as a running text Father Burke selects from among them many leading thoughts of spiritual life and makes corresponding appeal to his reader for spiritual insight and progress. It is his wish that the reader take up the text of the following day's Mass the evening before and by the use of corresponding meditation place himself in harmony with the spirit of Lent and the petitions that grow out of its nature as a penitential season.

The style of the little book is concise. There is scarcely a wasted word in it. The thought is penetrating. One constantly discovers new depths of meaning behind commonplace phrases. In other relations of life one tries to escape the commonplace by being original. In spiritual life one conquers the commonplace by earnestness of heart, elevated feeling and sureness of thought. This Father Burke has done admirably. In the course of these meditations one is brought again and again directly before the basic relations of God and man. Everything is centered upon Christ, Redeemer and Sanctifier. We are reminded of the insistent demand for consistency between belief and practice that the true lovers of Christ understand and respect. The mystery of individuality in each of us, the secret of wisdom and the acceptance of the Divine Will, the duty of understanding God's ways, the sacred rôle of penance, are all brought to attention with a force, directness and true honesty of style which Father Burke has taught us to expect from him always.

Lent and the Mass is timely at every season of the year. The work takes high place by the side of the author's *Christ In Us* which he published a year and a half ago. The Spiritual Book Associates have served their purpose well in conferring upon Father Burke's volume the distinction of its choice as Book of the Month for January.

THE CHURCH EDIFICE AND ITS APPOINTMENTS. The Reverend Harold E. Collins, Ph.D. The Dolphin Press, Philadelphia, Pa. Pp. xxii+192. 1936.

Perhaps the best way to begin a review of Father Collins's book will be to quote the opening paragraph of the preface. Father Collins writes: "It is not a book of ceremonies, nor is it a book of rubrics. And whereas the church architect and the liturgical artist may find in it helpful guidance, it does not presume to be a book on the liturgical arts. Its purpose is simply to gather together into a handy volume a summary of the laws governing the building, the dedication, and the furnishings of a Catholic church." With this definite purpose in mind Father Collins proceeds through eleven chapters to realize his goal. There are chapters on the building, the dedication and the divisions of a church. Following these, are chapters on the altar, the tabernacle, the furnishings of the altar, the furnishings of the sanctuary, the sacred vessels, the altar linens, and the sacred vestments. The last chapter describes the parochial registers.

Father Collins generally treats these subjects briefly. His language is clear and his explanations are as a rule satisfactory. Undoubtedly the author has spent considerable time gathering and preparing his notes for publication. The book will be useful.

There are, however, some inaccuracies. On page 89 the author says: " the altar crucifix may also be hung over the altar between the candlesticks." As authority for this statement, Father Collins says: " Cf. S. R. C., N. 4136 ad 2." In order to avoid any difficulty of incorrect translation and consequent injustice to the author we shall quote the decree in Latin. This question was asked by the Franciscans of Portugal: " II. An crux cum imagine crucifixi, in medio altaris inter candelabra collocanda, etiam in altari, ubi Sanctissimum reservatur, collocari possit immediate ante ejus tabernaculum; aut super ipsum, vel in postica ejus parte collocari debeat? " The Sacred Congregation of Rites answered, 11 June, 1904: "Crux collocetur inter candelabra, nunquam ante ostiolum tabernaculi. Potest etiam collocari super ipsum tabernaculum, non tamen in throno ubi exponitur Sanctissimum Eucharistiae Sacramentum." From this question and answer no support can be drawn to justify a hanging crucifix. In fact this precise question was not even asked. It is difficult to see any official liturgical authority for the more and more common use of the hanging crucifix. Those who advance the opinion of the legitimate use of such a crucifix must explain away the rather clear text of the rubric: *Super altare collocetur crux in medio.* This criticism has no reference whatever to the use of the crucifix when it is part of the altar piece or the reredos. Such a use of the crucifix is legitimate (Cf. S. C. R., N. 1270 ad II).

Another inaccuracy is found on p. 102. Father Collins says: " At low Mass which is strictly private, celebrated by any Bishop, four candles should be lighted." The inaccuracy does not exist in admitting and justifying the practice but in citing *Caeremoniale Episcoporum*, L. I., CXXIX, no. 4 as the authority for this statement. The Caeremonial Book for Bishops is quite clear in saying that four candles should burn during the Bishop's Mass on the higher festivals but equally clear in saying that on other days two candles are sufficient. It is true that the latter rubric is not prescriptive, but is far from giving authority to the statement made by Father Collins. The practice, of course, is certainly justified by the Roman and perhaps almost universal custom, and admitted by Van der Stappen, but one ought not to cite an authority inaccurately.

Despite the above criticisms, anyone who obtains a copy of Father Collins's book will have at hand a useful summary of the canonical and liturgical law regarding a church. The table of contents is constructed with ability. The index is very serviceable. The book takes its place with the other handbooks that are periodically published. Such works are useful and give ready access to information when it is wanted quickly.

THE SACRAMENT OF DUTY. By Joseph McSorley, C.S.P. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. Pp. 308. 1935.

If, at first sight, one finds oneself somewhat puzzled by the title of this work, the best procedure is to read the book itself. It is a new edition, with some added matter. The title is taken from the first essay in a group of eleven. In the etymological derivation, the word *sacrament* would " extend to everything that symbolizes and imparts the blessing of God to the soul of man ". Against those who would separate the word duty from any relation to God, it must be argued that duty is a sacrament, " because it is an expression of the will of God and a means of entering into communion with Him ". The remaining essays are: " Progress in Prayer ", " The Ideal Man ", " Soul-Blindness ", " On Being Cheerful ", " Meditation and Modern Life ", " Open-Mindedness ", " The School of Paul ", " God in the Soul ", " The Communion of Saints ", " The Unconverted World ".

To raise the modern mind to its age-old outlook on the world, Catholicism needs to know the modern spirit; to make an impression on a man-centered world, the Catholic should be able to speak the language of that world; old truths need to be newly stated; the particular tone of any decade requires interpretation in the light of unchanging truth. Fr. McSorley possesses the gift of adaptation to the spirit and tone of the day in which we live. There is no compromise with principle; there is no shading off of the unpleasant; there is, in this little book, a delightful presentation of Catholic truths to the modern temper.

Following from the author's power of adaptation, one notes his sympathy with the multitudes who are seeking truth. He has the spirit of understanding. Our Lord was kind to the outcast Samaritan woman, to the Gentile centurion. That same attitude is reflected in all that this literary Paulist writes. Such a point of view opens the door to the heart of truthseekers.

The fact that there is an essay on cheerfulness gives, perhaps, a clue to the writer's aim. He paints a spirituality which pulsates with life, that is far removed from the anemic. He reflects the sunshine of the

American scene. Like all true Catholic spirituality, this cheerfulness of the essays comes from the functioning of Christian self-denial.

The reader of these essays is also impressed with the substantiality of the thoughts expressed. Sometimes the author plumbs the depths of a spiritual truth, but ordinarily the " average reader " will find here a diet not unsuited to his taste and capacity. In contrast with many books of devotion, these writings show a grasp of the height and depth of the Catholic mind. There is no maudlin description of this or that sentimentality; a definite solidity is apparent throughout all the pages.

A reviewer feels obliged to pay tribute to the style of Fr. McSorley. Just as there is a freshness of approach to his subjects, so is the style in keeping with the manner of treatment. Because of this fact, rereading of the essays becomes pleasant rather than tedious. And they do merit to be read more than once. The chapter on " Soul Blindness " deserves special recommendation. Likewise, the matter treated in " Open-Mindedness " is fundamentally important. Priests who are searching for enduring literature can do much to make these essays known. And their very reasonable price places them within the reach of thousands.

INSTITUTIONES THEOLOGIAE MORALIS, quas veteri Compendio a P. Gareiele de Varceno, O.M.Cap., confecto P. Seraphinus a Loiano, O.M.Cap., S.T.L., suffecit. Vol. I, pp. vii+492. (1934). Vol. II, pp. iv+679. (1935). Marius E. Marietti, Taurini, Italia.

Fr. Loiano has done a scholarly piece of work in revising the contributions of his predecessor, Father Varceno, to Moral Theology. These works are published posthumously. The first volume deals with Fundamental Moral; the second volume is divided into three parts, viz., Theological Virtues, the Commandments of God, and the Precepts of the Church.

The author aims to collate the best efforts of recent and contemporary authorities, and to combine with the classical exposition of moral theology a synthetic view of the controverted problems of the present day. His objective has been achieved satisfactorily, especially regarding penal laws, vows, direct and indirect abortion, and the essence of lying. His treatment of lying and its relationship to incommunicable knowledge is exceptionally thorough and illuminating. The important subject of the right of the fetus to life, and the operations involving this right, although treated briefly, leaves nothing to be desired in the statement of sound principles and their application.

In many manuals the philosophical and dogmatic foundations of moral problems are merely hinted at; here they are sufficiently expressed. Moreover, there are a great many apt quotations from the recent Encyclicals.

There is an abundance of examples, although some of them are not above the reproach of being hackneyed. The material coöperator is again made to hold the ladder for the thief doing a second-story job. The book is deficient in omitting certain specific cases of coöperation, e.g. the sale of contraceptives, connivance with fraudulent financial transactions, etc. There is also a departure from the usual treatment in considering taxes and military service in Fundamental Theology, under the heading of the obligation of civil laws.

Not the least thing that can be said in praise of a scientific work is that it is couched in language that is perspicuous and precise. One does not find the tedium of unravelling intricate sentences and complicated arguments. Let us hope that in the remaining two volumes the author will maintain the high standard set in the first two.

MEDITATIONS FOR RELIGIOUS. By the Reverend John Janssen, S.V.D. Meditations for Every Day in the Ecclesiastical Year. Translated by Sister M. Alicia, S.C.N. Edited by Arthur Preuss. Published by P. J. Kenedy and Sons, New York. 1935. Vol. I and II., pp. 658, 582.

This work is an adaptation from the German " Goldenes Schätzkastlein für Ordensleute ". The original has been through several editions. It justly lays claim to being a meditation book out of the beaten track. Father Janssen, the author, is a brother of the founder of the Society of the Divine Word.

The first volume contains prayers to be used before and after meditation and a short introduction on mental prayer as described by Saint Teresa. Both volumes have a handy bookmark.

Volume one goes from the first Sunday in Advent to Pentecost. It has also meditations for the principal feasts of Saints from 30 November to 27 May. There are also meditations for the First Fridays from December to May, and meditations for each day of May. This volume has 658 pages. Volume two runs from the Feast of the Holy Trinity to the beginning of Advent. It also contains meditations for the principal feasts of Saints from 5 June to 25 November. It has also meditations for the First Fridays from June to November. This volume contains 582 pages.

The Sunday meditation is always on the Gospel of the day. All Friday meditations are on some phase of the Passion. All the meditations, except those for May, contain two preludes, three points, affections, practice (resolution), and a colloquy. Those for May have formally but two points and affections. In these the theological and cardinal virtues, the gifts of the Holy Ghost, and the religious state are considered in relation to Mary. Special prayers before and after meditation are given for May.

The meditations of the first volume in general are on sin, lessons drawn from Christmas and Epiphany, the four last things, penance, the capital sins, the Passion, Easter events and the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost. In the second volume the following subjects are meditated on: our relations with the Trinity, the Eucharist, mortification, the vows, perfection, prayer, zeal, the " Our Father ", the " Creed ", the Divine attributes and love.

The two volumes offer meditations that are alive in their presentation of the necessary laws and praiseworthy counsels of the religious life. Moral and dogma are made active with practical situations and applications to religious. The virtues, exemplified by Christ and the Saints, are probed to the depths by solid thinking.

Concise thought, personal and practical, is found on every page. Truths are presented in a convincing manner that strengthens us to hold to our ideal and gives us determination to forge ahead. Sound advice and direction help us to overcome the obstacles we may encounter, stimulate our affections, and prepare us to make a definite resolution each day.

The book makes a most attractive appearance.

RELIGION OUTLINES FOR COLLEGES. COURSE I. By John M. Cooper, D.D., The Catholic University of America. Second edition, revised. The Catholic Education Press, Washington, D. C. 1935. Pp. xv+315.

The excellent impression created by the first appearance of Dr. Cooper's work cannot but be intensified by this second revised edition. The revision has been profound, involving the addition of some one hundred pages of text and the restatement of a score of problems. The deletions and insertions have been made in the light of ten years of classroom experience. To a selected bibliography, which was already an outstanding achievement, about eighty items have been added. We dare say, no better practical guide to Catholic religious literature in the English language has ever been printed than that found in the four volumes of the series. Theologians might demur about a certain imprecision of language and the choice of elements singled out for special emphasis. Thus, the concept of the Mystical Body gives way to the " kindred concept of the family, of God as our Father, of Christ as our Elder Brother, of all humanity as one great family under

God ". Dr. Cooper would probably reply that he had no intention of writing for theologians and that his method of presentation had been chosen for pedagogical reasons. There is a tang to his language and a highly personalized approach to problems, designed to catch the volatile attention of the young minds for whom he writes.

His work will, doubtless, continue to enjoy the enthusiastic approval of the modern educator.

A CATECHISM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE NO. 2. WITH STUDY LESSONS. By Ellamay Horan. New York: W. H. Sadlier, Inc. 1935. Pp. vii + 167.

KEY TO STUDY LESSONS FOR A CATECHISM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE NO. 2. Prepared by Ellamay Horan. New York: W. H. Sadlier, Inc. 1935. Pp. 20.

LEARNING MY RELIGION. PRIMER. By the Right Rev. Mgr. M. A. Schumacher and Sister Mary Imelda. New York: Benziger Brothers. 1935. Pp. 62.

LEARNING MY RELIGION. BOOK ONE. By the Right Rev. Mgr. M. A. Schumacher and Sister Mary Imelda. New York: Benziger Brothers. 1935. Pp. 114.

GUIDE BOOK ACCOMPANYING LEARNING MY RELIGION. By the Right Rev. Mgr. M. A. Schumacher and Sister Mary Imelda. New York: Benziger Brothers. 1935. Pp. iii + 58.

The so-called Baltimore Catechism continues, despite all its faults, to be in wide use, although recognized from the beginning as a poor medium for religious instruction.

Dr. Ellamay Horan, who has deserved so well of religious education in our country and is the Editor of *The Journal of Religious Instruction*, has taken pains to provide helpful study lessons to accompany the Catechism. Every lesson of the Catechism is followed by completion tests and various exercises which will associate in the mind of the learner everyday living with the truths of Faith and which will let the doctrines of religion serve as motivation for Christian conduct. The author intends all exercises to be primarily study material, and not testing devices. Only the last exercise in each lesson is to be looked upon as a test. Dr. Horan recommends that this exercise be undertaken by pupils at the beginning of the class period on the day following the class discussion of the " Note Book Exercise ". Pupils should be shown how to correct and criticise their own work. That they " may be protected from any temptation to dishonesty in answering the test, marks or scores should not be given." Is there no better way to train pupils to honesty than such a procedure, which is liable to lessen the pupil's estimate of the importance of religious instruction?

Though the authors of *Learning My Religion* grant that the Baltimore Catechism has defects, they contend that it " has the most clear, concise, and complete explanation of Catholic doctrine in the English language ". Many priests, however, believe that " The Catechism of Christian Doctrine ", approved by the Hierarchy of England and Wales, is vastly superior to the Baltimore Catechism, and *The Month*, of London, England, agreed, in its issue of November, 1935, that *Catholic Faith*, the Catholic University edition of Cardinal Gasparri's Catechism (Kenedy, New York), is " in every way superior to any of its predecessors ". In his address, given recently at the Catechetical Congress in Rochester, New York, Archbishop McNicholas contended " that the chief defect of the Baltimore Catechism is its inadequate consideration of the virtues and the spiritual life ".

It would be premature to express a final judgment on *Learning My Religion*. Though the title-page tells us that the series will bring " the questions and answers of the Catechism prepared and enjoined by the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore," the books available at present, i. e., the Primer and Book I, contain no such questions and answers, but offer attractive pictures in color and easy reading lessons that are intended to convey the concepts of the Catechism. In the hands of an experienced teacher, this material should prove useful. The *Guide Book* will help the inexperienced teacher in using the material. The further books of this series, one for each grade of the elementary school, will be awaited with much interest.

PAIN AND THE PROVIDENCE OF GOD. By M. C. D'Arcy, S.J. Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee. 1935. Pp. 133.

The problem dealt with in this book is, of course, an old one. It assumes, however, different forms in different ages. The philosopher must, therefore, adjust himself to his day. This, Father D'Arcy has aimed to do. The secene is an imaginary forum, in which men of differing persuasions listen to a reader of a paper, and intrude with their own viewpoints or objections at any moment. Consequently, we hear from an ecclesiastic, an atheist, an author, a bore (objections only), a psychologist, a scientist, an agnostic, an unknown, a mystic, an artist and a last doubter. After each has presented his argument, the reader of the paper gives his answer. The approach has been entirely from the viewpoint of philosophy and reason. After all have been heard, the priest enters upon the scene and shows the shortcomings of philosophy, and what revelation adds to a solution of the problem.

The presentation of an argument form an objector's viewpoint naturally adds to the fulness of the discussion. The reader of the paper had taken as his position the task of showing that God is just. And the author meets with candor all the fears and misunderstandings of the modern mind. The whole treatment is objective and conducted on a high plane of thought. Father D'Arcy has a wide range of information from which to draw. He has succeeded in adapting old arguments to modern conditions. For the trained thinker, the book has real interest. The style is facile, more facile than the reasonings of most philosophers.

As is usual with Bruce publications, the volume is attractive and neatly arranged. We recommend it especially to philosophers and priests.

SURVEY OF A DECADE: THE THIRD ORDER SECULAR OF ST. FRANCIS IN THE UNITED STATES. By Fr. Maximus Poppy, O.F.M., and Paul R. Martin, M.A. St. Louis, B. Herder Book Co. 1935. Pp. xxi + 805 + lxi.

This is a veritable encyclopedia of first-hand information regarding the Third Order Secular of St. Francis in the United States. Established by St. Francis more than seven hundred years ago, the Third Order became practically as widespread as the First Order. However, until 1921, the fraternities in the United States were more or less isolated and lacking provincial or national organization. In 1921, however, consequent upon long and thorough preparation, the first national congress was held in Chicago. This national meeting gave impetus to the Third Order movement, influencing its membership both spiritually and numerically. A second national congress in New York City in 1926, and a third in San Francisco in 1931, followed the congress of 1921.

The present volume contains the proceedings and papers of the second and third congresses. No one who glances at the imposing array of scholarly addresses from outstanding laymen, priests and bishops, will fail to be impressed with the importance of the Third Order as a renovating power in our religious and social life. The volume also contains the English translations of the chief Encyclicals on the Third Order since 1882, and a chronological table of other outstanding Papal pronouncements referring to the same lay Order. The bibliography of Franciscana will be most welcome to the student in Franciscan research, while the sermon topics and suggestions for the monthly meeting will prove valuable to Third Order directors.

All in all, this volume will be found eminently useful and interesting to both layman and ecclesiastic and may well be called the last word on the status of the Third Order in this country. The Preface by His Excellency, Archbishop Amleto Giovanni Cicognani, Apostolic Delegate to the United States, is highly commendatory.

MUSIC: SECOND YEAR. Catholic Education Series: Justine Ward. Washington, Catholic Education Press. Teacher's Manual, pp. 224; Children's Song Manual: pp. 128. 1936.

Music Second Year is presented not only in a Teacher's Manual, a set of charts, but also in a children's book of delightful melodies, songs and chants. The revised edition of Justine Ward's Second Year Manual is recognized by educators as a valuable asset in the field of musical education, which to-day affords a cultural development that is of vital importance in the moral training of the child. The author has practically rebuilt the introduction to musical knowledge, basing her approach on the peculiar psychological needs of the times. Recognizing the increased demand for pupil activity and self-expression, she here presents a systematic method that aims at accurate visual and auditive sense training, and at a sensory motor development, which serves to quicken the powers of observation and memory, as well as to stimulate imagination and creative effort.

The clarity and simplicity of the lesson plan, the perfect order and sequence and the wide scope for various play activities given in the directions and suggestions, make the Teacher's Manual an invaluable instrument in the hands of any class teacher. It is the grade teacher, with her knowledge of child psychology and her sympathetic interest in the cultural and moral development of the children, that is best fitted to correlate music with the other subjects taught.

The format of *Children's Song Manual* of delightful melodies, songs and liturgical chants is designed for children of a Second Grade and fills a need which few publications supply. The work, with its animated illustrations, is a valuable contribution, serving to sustain not only interest, but a sense-correlation. The sketches are modernistic in design, with that peculiar combination of fascinating charm and spiritual symbolism that creates a powerful urge within the child, not only to study the details of the pictures, but in musical language to interpret the sentiments aroused.

The author has achieved in this unpretentious book the goal of research and practical class experimentation. The fact that many of the melodies are the actual compositions of children of their own age evokes an ambition to compete in like constructions. The fascinating folksongs so rhythmic, so pulsating with playful activity, enchant the little ones, with their varied movements and their self-interpretation. With its gay little melodies, attractive but purposeful, with its unique arrangement and the gradual development of technique unconsciously assimilating the more difficult musical constructions, with its simplicity, its astounding appeal to the child's love of life and the things of nature, with its international folksongs vibrating with simple emotions, with its spiritual carols and hymns, its true psychological basis, Mrs. Ward has given to the class teacher and to every Second Grade child an invaluable aid in training the natural ability to express the innermost feelings of the soul. Since the moral training of our little ones is of such supreme obligation to Catholic teachers, we must use every means available to the attainment of that end.

THE ARK AND THE DOVE, THE BEGINNINGS OF CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTIES IN AMERICA. By J. Moss Ives. Longmans, Green and Co., New York. 1936.

Judge Ives, a non-Catholic lawyer of Connecticut, has written the most Catholic account of the Maryland Palatinate under the Catholic Calverts that this reviewer has ever read, and he does not except Bishop Russell's *Maryland, The Land of the Sanctuary* (1908) or H. S. Spalding's *Catholic Colonial Maryland* (1931). He has written an appreciation of the labors of the Carrolls (Charles, Daniel and Bishop John) which would satisfy any of their biographers; and no patriotic Marylander can raise a note of criticism after reading Judge Ives's account of the colony or his defence of Maryland's claim to the origin of the principle of American toleration as over against that of Rhode Island's promoters. Of the Catholic Calverts, of their successors, the Catholic Carrolls, and of the Jesuits, there is no suggestion of criticism, yet the author is not hesitant in his condemnation of Puritan narrowness in Maryland or in the Bay Colony.

He may have a thesis, but if so it is a beautiful thesis, the laudation of democracy and toleration which he apparently sees as indigenous to the soil of the Maryland of the Calverts and of White and Altham and their followers in the Society of Jesus. He tells the story in an interesting way and he has based his story upon a rather generous reading of the available printed materials on his subject, which he lists in an extended bibliography and which includes a rather full list of Catholic writings. The volume is good literature and very readable history, even though there is little in fact or in interpretation that is new. It is an honest brief. It may not be objective enough for the historical scholar, but it is sufficiently accurate for not only the general reader but the general student of history. It deserves a wide circle of readers, and no one of them will put down the book without having learned some history, without having a finer appreciation of the Catholic Church and without an additional sense of responsibility to maintain democracy and toleration as two fundamental principles of the American pattern of life. No Catholic writer could pen so appreciative a study without being criticized as a partisan, and subjective chronicler.

Mr. Ives relies more than the reviewer would on Mr. Belloc for the Stuart background and on Woodrow Wilson's popular *History of the United States*. There are a number of statements that might be queried: " From all that is known of Calvert and his tolerant views, it is more than probable that he was largely responsible for granting permission to the Mayflower pilgrims to settle in New England." " There was to be no taxation without representation in Maryland. The power of assessing taxes no longer rested with the King or parliament, but was placed directly in the hands of the colonists themselves." " There is every reason to believe, therefore, that in order to avoid taking the oath of supremacy the Catholic emigrants did not embark until after the ships had dropped down to Cowes. This being so, the Catholics constituted a majority of voyagers, although this has been seriously disputed." He has no doubts of the direct influence of Suarez and Bellarmine on American democracy and toleration. " Of the four Stuart kings, James II was the least friendly and gave the least support to the proprietary government of Maryland. In his brief reign of three years he did not evince the slightest interest in the cause of religious liberty in the Baltimore Colony." He apparently sees a large Irish immigration into Maryland.

The author's estimate of the contribution of the Carrolls is most generous, especially in the promotion of the toleration principles in the Federal Constitution. Possibly Charles Carroll did save " the American Revolution from being tainted with religious bigotry ". Possibly, Charles Carroll declined a seat in the constitutional convention because he felt that his duty was to save Maryland from inflation and the catastrophe of cheap money. Nowhere else will one find the democratic James Wilson and the aristocratic Daniel Carroll so closely coupled together. One can hardly agree with the statement: " It is safe to state, therefore, that Charles Carroll of Carrollton was the father of the electoral college. If it had not been that this plan was offered as a compromise measure, the choice of the president would undoubtedly have been left to Congress and the people would have had no say in the choice of their executive." Or in connexion with the reputed alliance of Wilson and Daniel Carroll, one might like a demonstration of the assertion: " The president would never have been the choice of the people had it not been for the combined work of Wilson and Carroll, and could they have had their way the people would have expressed their choice directly and not indirectly through electors." Again: " It was the combined influence of these three men, Bishop John Carroll, Charles Carroll of Carrollton and Daniel Carroll, that contributed more to the recognition of the principle of religious liberty in the United States Constitution, than any other factor. Largely through their efforts the spirit of the Old Maryland became the spirit of the New America."

THE BOURGEOIS MIND. By Nicholas Berdyaev. Sheed and Ward: New York. Pp. 130.

This volume takes its title from the first essay in a collection of four. The others are: Man and Machine, Christianity and Human Activity, The Worth of Christianity and the Unworthiness of Christians. The content and scope of the book may be gleamed from these chapter headings. The analysis of Marxian philosophy which is found in the essays is not, however, suggested by the titles.

The key to the first essay is found in this sentence: " Middle-classness is not determined by man's economic situation but by his spiritual attitude toward this position " (p. 23). The trend of the second chapter is glimpsed in this thought: " There can be no technical ends of life, only technical means: the ends of life belong to another sphere, that of the spirit. Very often the aims of life are superseded by its means, which then usurp so important a place in human life as completely to eliminate its ultimate object from man's consciousness " (p. 33). In the third essay the author shows that Christianity is not a defeatist view, but has actually been responsible for the world's forward movements. The fourth theme deserves attention. Our so-called scientific age is guilty of subjectivism and emotionalized attitudes toward truth. The opponent of Christianity will observe bad Christians but will refuse to study Christianity in its doctrine. He has the same policy that the Pharisees employed toward Christ.

Mr. Berdyaev is no dilettante, throwing pebbles at a rocky cliff. He is fearless, and dodges no issue; he sees both sides of a question. His thrusts are rapier-like; his thoughts are clear. A Catholic critic would not accept all the implications on pages 115 and 119; but every Catholic would wish this book to be given an unusually wide circulation. It is a book for priests, educators, statesmen.

Literary Chat

Thanks to the vigilance and determined efforts of the Catholic Press Association, the roving band of dishonest subscription solicitors is growing gradually less. One after another, these glib and persuasive swindlers, who seem to make a speciality of preying upon the clergy, are being arrested and put behind prison bars. But not all of them have been caught yet and sent to jail, or scared out of their mean ways. If our readers would occasionally warn their unwary parishioners against the bogus tales of this gypsy crew of petty thieves, and if priests themselves are on their guard against these plausible pedlars, this nuisance should soon end.

Dr. John M. Cooper, Professor of Anthropology at the Catholic University and Secretary of the Catholic Anthropological Conference, has published in *Primitive Man* (Vol. VIII, NN. 1 and 2) a study of evolution that should do much to guide us in discussing evolution intelligently. Writing mainly for the non-professional reader he reviews "the main lines of empirical evidence *pro* and *con* bearing upon the problem of evolution as regards the human body and the human mind". His conclusion is as follows: "It appears that human bodily evolution is not strictly demonstrated by the evidence. It is equally clear that from the scientific evidence it cannot be demonstrated that bodily evolution did not occur. It is also clear that the theory is something more than a guess, something more than pure speculation, something not bereft of all probability. Nor does there appear to be any scientific evidence cogently making for the strong improbability of the theory". So far as the human body is concerned, the evidence in favor of the theory, while still far from demonstrative in the strict sense of the term, has increased very much since the days of Darwin, and no important new data have come to light that would positively militate against the theory. So far as the human mind is concerned, the evidence since the same days has, the present writer feels, quite perceptibly weakened, clearly with the progress of cultural and linguistic anthropology and seemingly with the progress of comparative psychology and of the experimental psychology of the higher human mental processes. We cannot, the present writer believes, demonstrate from the available scientific evidence that human mental evolution was impossible. But it looks improbable. The evidence commonly adduced in favor of it breaks down badly nearly all along the line when submitted to close analysis and criticism. The chasm between the brute mind and the human mind is at present unspanned, and we can see no way in which it could have been spanned in the past."

Dr. Cooper's study is a perfect model of scholarly search for truth in a highly controversial field, and it contains a good critical bibliography.

The Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference has just published in a pamphlet the outline of an economic program for the United States that would incorporate the teaching of Pius XI. (*Organized Social Justice*, Paulist Press, New York City, pp. 31.) It will serve admirably for use by Study Clubs. With that in mind a study outline is offered. The salient points of *Quadragesimo Anno* are brought to attention in a series of notes. The statement of principles is endorsed by about one hundred and fifty signers to whom it was submitted in advance.

It is difficult for the average man to gain an inclusive and coördinated view of social life. Reform measures can be understood one by one. But when not seen in relation to a philosophy they lack authority and inspiration. This concise interpretation of the teaching of the Holy Father combines details with philosophy in harmony with moral and spiritual truth. Pastors will do well to recommend it to Study Clubs now in operation or to clubs that they might be moved to organize with the hope of furthering the interests of social justice.

Father Edmund A. Walsh, S.J., who is so well known for his critical studies of Radicalism particularly in Russia, has written a little book of great charm in a widely distant field. In *The Woodcarver of Tyrol* (Harper and Brothers, pp. 49) he shows the devastating power of war to reach into the remote mountain district of Tyrol and bring destruction and despair where peace, faith and happiness had dwelt. Caspar, an old man greatly skilled in woodcarving, is handing on the secrets of his skill to his son Konrad as the latter is drafted. He is killed in action. The father dies and the family is left in desolation. The little book is most attractive and written with real literary feeling. It is well worth while.

Some facts not generally known are to be found in the booklet: *Catholics and the American Declaration of Independence,* by the Rev. John M. Lenhart, O.M.Cap. (Central Bureau, C.C.V. of A., St. Louis, Mo.) The historian Shea's dictum that "every Catholic was a Whig," has not stood the test of modern scholarship. Anti-Catholic bigotry, not a small factor in the move for independence, caused a large number of Catholics to be suspicious of a movement motivated by antagonism to their faith. The author also shows the influence of the Canadian question on the minds of the American authorities. The Canadian aspect is really the better part of the pamphlet. In refuting the statement of Mr. Maynard that the Catholics of that day saw a similarity between the principles of the Declaration of Independence and their own philosophy, the author has presumed too much on the rating of Mr. Maynard as an American historian. He might, for instance, have found of interest the book of Sylvester McNamara, *American Democracy and Catholic Doctrine.*

In more than one instance history has been a conspiracy against the truth. An illustration of this fact is found in the fable that the early English Protestants welcomed the Bible in the vernacular. Scholars no longer hold that hoary tradition. The story of the sixteenth-century effort at alternate forbidding and then forcing the vernacular Bible on the people is told in Fr. Lenhart's recent booklet, *The First English Protestant Bible and Its Significance* (Central Bureau Press, St. Louis, Mo.). The author is an expert in the field of the history of the printing of the Bible. In this work, relying solely on Protestant authorities, he paints the sorry picture of the beginnings of that English tradition which in later centuries was to become so influential. The author also shows the tenacity of that custom of preferring the Latin Bible to the vernacular, a custom which continued up into the first quarter of the eighteenth century.

St. Anthony's Guild of Paterson, N. J., has ready its *1936 Franciscan Almanac,* which is now in its thirtieth year, and which was formerly known as St. Anthony's Almanac. It is a well-established little yearly, of 482 pages full of intelligently assorted and carefully compiled information on Catholic and secular topics. The handy little manual opens with an Index covering more than eight double-column pages and showing how varied and rich are the contents within its paper covers.

The great religious movement which was begun in the United States in 1895 has had a phenomenal growth. Perhaps you attended the seventh National Eucharistic Congress and beheld that supreme and glorious demonstration of Catholic Faith. But whether you were present or not, the Catholic Universe Bulletin (Official newspaper of the Cleveland Diocese) has published a complete story of the Congress in its special annual number. *The Seventh National Eucharistic Congress* presents within its 176 pages a complete account of the Congress, the more important addresses, a synopsis of the Eucharistic Congress movement both national and international, and a brief review of the birth and development of Catholicity in the United States. There are 64 pages devoted to a complete rotogravure story of this historic event.

Thoughts on the Holy Eucharist and *Thoughts on Our Divine Friend* are the III and IV Series of those truly different Eucharistic meditations by the Rev. J. E. Moffat, S.J. The books are sturdy, small and handy (5½x3½x½). The printing is pleasing, and perfectly done on excellent paper.

When it comes to the content and the thought, the same excellence is maintained. First the reader is given, on two short pages, a simple, intelligible and satisfying explanation of the reason and the manner of meditating. Then follow interesting as well as thought-provoking meditations. It is to be remarked about these meditations on the life of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament, that the author does not do the thinking for the reader. He leads one on, not only to converse with Jesus during the meditation—seldom more than two hundred words—but also to think about Jesus after the time of meditation. They are a distinct departure from those stiff, cold and impersonal bundles of threadbare phrases which have been passing as meditations.

There are various printed explanations of the Creed. Each priest's library is perhaps stocked with standard works on the beliefs of the Church. However, the reviewer is not aware of any book that resembles the radio talks assembled in *The Apostles' Creed,* by the Rev. Richard Felix, O.S.B. (Pilot Grove, Mo., 1935; pp. 184.) In twenty-four chapters the author discusses almost every doctrine in which the people should be instructed. Moreover, at the end of each chapter he answers the questions that are usually raised by inquirers.

This work is a popular exposition, not an erudite, theological tome. It is practical, not theoretical. It is *multum in parvo.* The Index has listed nearly one hundred and seventy-five subjects. The style is simple, sometimes rather heavy, but not too technical. In fact, there is not lacking a certain solid eloquence.

Perhaps, not every priest would be as positive as is the author in denying the evolution of man's body. And in some instances the author might have weaved in some better illustrations of his truths from background that is familiar to Americans. Generally speaking, however, busy priests, study club leaders, and hard-working teachers will derive helpful hints from this work. Its best service would be found in the home. The average Catholic need have no hesitation in buying this practical exposition of the Creed.

Legislacion Eclesiastica sobre el Ayuno y Astinencia, is a dissertation by Fray Antonio Parra Herrera, O.C.D., J.C.L. In the first part of his treatise of 200 pages the author gives the signification, history, universality, and importance of fast and abstinence in so far as they touch on religion. After a brief sketch of the Hebrew fasts in the Old Testament, the author goes over to the fast of Christ, the Apostles, and the early Church. Various days and seasons of fast and abstinence as we know them, such as Fridays, Vigils, Ember Days, Lent and Advent, are traced back to their beginnings; their development, spread, and stabilization in the universal Church are clearly outlined.

The second part is an exposition of the present laws of fast and abstinence in the Church; their obligation as to persons, times, and localities; dispensations and exemptions from the same. Special indults granted to Spain, Portugal, Latin America, Philippine Islands, and the United States are treated, with emphasis on the "Bula de Cruzada".

All sources and references are carefully noted, and there is the usual alphabetical index. We have here the finished work of a scholar. (The Catholic University, Washington, D. C.)

Books Received

BIBLICAL.

THE GOSPEL OF SAINT MARK. Presented in Greek Thought-Units and Sense-Lines, with a commentary by the Rev. James A. Kleist, S.J., Ph.D. Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. 1936. Pp. xvii—260. Price, $3.50.

BIBLICAL QUESTIONS. VOL. II—NEW TESTAMENT. By Rudolph G. Bandas. St. Anthony Guild Press, Paterson, N. J. 1936. Pp. viii—297. Price, $1.00.

SYNOPSIS LATINA LUATTCIORE Evangeliorum secundum Vulgatum. Ioannes Perk, Sal Soc. Sac. Ferdinandi Schoeningh, Paderbornae, 1935. Pp. 159. Kart 2.70; Gebd. 3.80.

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

COMPENDIUM THEOLOGIAE MORALIS, iuxta methodum Ioannis Petri Gury S.I., ad normam Codicis iuris Canonici redactum a Raphaele Tummolo, S.I. Editio quinta quam recognovit emendavit et auxit Thomas A. Iorio, eiusdam Societatis. M. D'Auria, S. Sedis Apostolicae Typographus, Neapoli, Italia. 1935. Pp. 437.

A CATECHISM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE, No. 1. Prepared and enjoined by order of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. With Study Lessons by Ellamay Horan. W. H. Sadlier, Inc., New York City. 1936. Pp. viii—168. Price, 10c *net*.

DIE FROHBOTSCHAFT UND UNSERE GLAUBENSVERKUNDIGUNG. Josef Andreas Jungmann, S.J. Friedrich Pustet, Regensburg. 1936. Pp. xi—240. Preis, Kart. Rm. 4.50, Geb. Rm. 5.50.

THÉOLOGIE ET PIÉTÉ, D'APRÈS SAINT THOMAS. Par le R. P. Timothée Richard, O.P. P. Lethielleux, Paris. 1936. Pp. 384. Prix, 15 fr.

ŒUVRES SACERDOTALES. Œuvres choisies de Saint Jean Eudes, Vol. VI. Par Saint Jean Eudes. Préface du R. P. Lebrun. P. Lethielleux, Paris. 1935. Pp. vi—545. Prix, 20 fr.

THE THREE HOURS' AGONY OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. By the Rev. John A. Elbert, S.M. Bruce Publishing Co., Wilwaukee, Wisconsin. 1936. Pp. 123. Price, $0.75.

FAITH FOR LIFE. By the Rev. James J. Graham, M.A. Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, Wisconsin. 1936. Pp. xiv-346. Price, $1.40.

DICTIONNAIRE DE SPIRITUALITÉ. Ascétique et Mystique, Doctrine et Histoire. Publié sous la Direction de Marcel Viller, S.J., assisté de F. Cavallera et J. De Guibert, S.J., avec le Concours d'un grand nombre de Collaborateurs. Fascicule V. Basile (saint)—Bibliothèques. Gabriel Beauchesne et ses Fils, Paris. 1935. Pp. 317.

LITURGICAL.

SACRED MUSIC AND THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. By the Rev. George V. Predmore. McLaughlin & Reilly Company, Boston, Mass. 1936. Pp. xvi—219. Price, $2.50.

L'ANTIFONARIO DELL'UFFICIO ROMANO. P. Alfonz., O.S.B., Prem. Tipografia Dei Monasteri, Subiaco, 1935. Pp. 171, prezzo, L. 12.

ORDO DIVINI OFFICII RECITANDI Sacrique peragendi juxta Kalendarium Ecclesiae Universalis pro anno Domini Bissextili 1936. Marietti, Taurini (Italia). Pp. 133.

RITUS PRO ORDINIBUS CONFERENDIS EX PONTIFICALE ROMANO. Marietti, Taurini (Italia). Pp. 116.

LE MAGNIFICAT. Traduction et Explication d'après les Meilleurs Commentaires. Desclée De Brouwer et Cie, Paris. 1936. Pp. 72.—Prix, 4 fr.

FRANZISKANISCHE FORSCHUNGENS Heft 1. Karle P. Christian Brez. Franziskus Drückerei, Werl in Westf., 1935. Pp. 183. 4, 8orm.

THE HOUR OF PRIME. The Office of Prime for every day of the week from the Roman Breviary, for the use of the laity. Edited by the Benedictine Monks of St. John's Abbey, Collegeville, Minn. The Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minn. 1936. Pp. 113. Price, 15c per copy.

PHILOSOPHICAL.

AN AUGUSTINE SYNTHESIS. Arranged by the Rev. Erich Przywara, S.J. Introduction by the Rev. C. C. Martindale, S.J. Sheed & Ward, New York City. 1936. Pp. xvi—495. Price, $4.00.

Philosophiae Christianae Institutiones in usum Adolescentium. Fr. Bernardus M. Mariani. Vol. 1. Logica et Metaphysica Generalis. 1932. Pp. x—333. Vol. 11. Philosophia Naturalis, Psychologia et Metaphysica Specialis. 1933. Pp. xxxii—743. Vol. III. Ethica Generalis et Specialis Historia Philosophiae et Indices. 1936. Pp. xxix—710. Casa Editrice Marietti, Torino, Italy. Prezzo, Vol. 1, Lib It. 16; Vol. II, Lib. It. 30; Vol. III, Lib. It. 28.

The Christian Faith in the Modern World. By J. Gresham Machen, D.D., Litt.D. The Macmillan Company, New York City. 1936. Pp. vii—258. Price, $2.00.

Sept ans d'examen particulier, à la suite de Saint Thomas (Conférences aux Ursulines). Par E. Dassault. P. Lethielleux, éditeur 10, rue Cassette, Paris (VI^{e}). Pp. xii + 190. Prix, 12 fr.

S. Augustinus et Doctrina de Duplici Justitia. Inquisitio historico-critica in Opinionem Hieronymi Seripandi (1493-1563) de Justificatione ejusque Habitudinem ad Doctrinam S. Augustini. Auctore, P. Dr. Joseph Henninger S.V.D. Missionsbuchandlung St. Gabriel Abt. Verlag, Lieferschein, Nr. 1935. Pp. x—164.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Correlative English. A Textbook for the Second Year of High School. By Llewelyn Lloyd, M.A. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Mo. 1936. Pp. xii—303. Price, $1.25.

The Labour Contract. By Professor B. F. Shields, M.A., Dean of the Faculty of Commerce, University College, Dublin. Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., London, England. Pp. xvi—152. Price, 5 shillings.

Der Grosse Herder. Nachschlagewerk fur Wissen und Leben. Vierte, vollig neubearbeitete Auslage von Herders Konverstioneslexikon. Zwolfter Band. Unterfuhrung bis 33. Mit Unhang: A. Systematisches Verzeichnis der Kahmenartikel, Tafeln, Bildseiten oder Bildgruppen. B. Erganzende Verweisungen. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Mo. 1935. Pp. 1702. Price, $9.50.

Music Second Year, Justine Ward. Teacher's Manual. The Catholic Education Series, Washington, D. C. Illustrations by Frances Delehanty. Pp. 223. 1936.

Children's Song Manual by Justine Ward. Music Second Year. The Catholic Education Series, Washington, D. C. Illustrations by Frances Delehanty. Pp. 128. 1936.

Pamphlets of the International Catholic Truth Society. *Prayers to Saint Joseph.* With Novena. Pp. 24. Price, per single copy 5c; per hundred, $4.00. *A Manual of Lenten Devotion.* Pp. 48. Price, per single copy, 10c; per hundred, $7.00. *How to be Happy.* Pp. 45. Price, per single copy, 10c; per hundred, $7.00. The International Catholic Truth Society, 407 Bergen St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Pamphlets of The Catholic Truth Society, London, England. *Reflections by Firelight.* By Vera Barclay. Pp. 32. *Psycho-Analysis and Other Aspects of Psychology.* By C. L. C. Burns, M.R.C.S. Pp. 23. *The Devotion of the Nine First Fridays.* By a Secular Priest. Pp. 30. *The Beatitudes.* By the Rt. Rev. Monsignor R. H. Benson. Pp. 35. *Catholic Customs in the Home.* By the Very Rev. Ethelbert Horne. Pp. 40. *Youth.* By the Very Rev. Bede Jarrett, O.P. Pp. 48. *The Holy Ghost.* By the Very Rev. Bede Jarrett, O.P. Pp. 48. *Good Day.* By B. M. Frederick. Pp. 38. *Catholic Customs in the Church.* By the Very Rev. Ethelbert Horne. Pp. 46. *Thanksgiving Prayers.* Pp. 46. 1936. Price, twopence each.

The Conquest of Fear. By Rev. John A. O'Brien, Ph.D., LL.D. Price $0.05 each; $3.50 a hundred. *Boys, Girls and Standards.* By Alice Douglas Kelly. Pp. 31. Price $0.05 each; $3.50 a hundred. *After Death—What?* By Rev. Gerald C. Treacy, S.J. Pp. 32. Price $0.05 each; $3.50 a hundred. *A First Book for First Communicants.* By a Religious of the Sacred Heart. Pp. 30. Price $0.05 each; $3.50 a hundred. *The Hail Mary for Children.* By Rev. Daniel M. Dougherty. Pp. 32. Price $0.05 each; $3.50 a hundred. The Paulist Press, New York.

Church Property and Its Management. By H. A. Frommelt, E.E., M.A. Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, Wisconsin. 1936. Pp. 374. Price, $3.00.

The Protestant Mind—In 1935 A. D. By the Rev. Maurice O'Connor. Pp. 31. *Mexico Destroys Religious Freedom.* Mexico's Policies in the Light of American Ideals. By the Rev. John A. O'Brien, Ph.D. Pp. 39. *Home, School & Co.* By the Rev. Felix M. Kirsch, O.M.Cap. Pp. 21. *Maid of the Sacred Sword.* By the Rev. Francis E. Benz and John S. Gibbons. Pp. 21.—*A Grown Up Altar Boy.* By the Editors of The Catholic Boy. Pp. 14. *The Christian Faith Before the Bar of Reason.* By the Most Rev. J. F. Noll, D.D., LL.D. Pp. 27. 1936. Price, 10c each; 5 copies, 25c. *Explanations for a Stranger Attending Catholic Services.* 1936. Pp. 32. Price, 10c per copy; $3.00 per hundred copies. *If Not Christianity, What?* By the Rev. James M. Gillis, C.S.P. 1936. Pp. 84. Price, $25c. *The Fullness of Christ.* By the Very Rev. Monsignor Fulton J. Sheen, Ph.D., LL.D. Our Sunday Visitor Press, Huntington, Indiana. 1936. Pp. 168. Price, 60c.

My Audience With the Holy Father. By Rachel K. McDowell, Religious News Editor of "The New York Times". Pp. 48. *Organized Social Justice.* An Economic Program for the United States applying Pius XI's Great Encyclical on Social Life. Notes and a Study Outline. Pp. 31, *Mercy Killing is Murder!* By the Rev. Ignatius W. Cox, S.J. Pp. 15. *First Friday Thoughts.* By the Rev. William J. Smith, S.J. Pp. 32. *The "Our Father".* By the Rev. Daniel M. Dougherty. The Paulist Press, New York City. 1936. Pp. 32. Price, 5c each.

Self-Conquest. By the Rev. F. X. Lasance. Benziger Brothers, New York City. 1936. Pp. 270. Price, $1.00.

The 1936 Franciscan Almanac. Published by St. Anthony's Guild, Franciscan Monastery, Paterson, N. J. Pp. xix—482. Price, 50c, postpaid 60c.